DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 827 HE 000 487

Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City.
Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
Pub Date Dec 68
Note- 106p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.40
Descriptors-City Problems, *Community Service Programs, *Higher Education, *Social Responsibility, *Urban Universities
Identifiers-*Harvard University

In May 1968, a committee was appointed at Harvard to evaluate the University's effort in helping both community and nation find solutions to urban distress, poverty, economic imbalance, racial inequality, and disease. The committee was charged with recommending new actions if necessary and determining the role Harvard should play in responding to urban issues as a center of learning and as an urban institution. After a brief description of the nature of the University and surrounding community, there are discussions on how Harvard's degree programs, organization, policies, facilities, and finances affect the community. Individuals within and outside Harvard were consulted and 3 research programs were carried out: a study of the views black-serving employment organizations had of Harvard as a job source, an opinion survey of a representative sample of the tenants in Harvard owned buildings in Cambridge, and an Inventory of Community Projects at Harvard. The Inventory, describing the service activities of the various schools and departments of the University, was designed to stimulate and inform discussions by the several faculties of their own social policies and responsibilities. (JS)

ED027827

⑫

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City

DECEMBER 1968

This preliminary report has been printed for circulation to members of the University and others who may wish to consider its contents. This circulation is solely to facilitate discussion, and should not be construed to indicate acceptance of the views stated in this report by the Faculties, by the President, or by the Governing Boards.

HE000487

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City

DECEMBER 1968

PREFACE

IN THIS TIME of social and political restlessness, far-reaching impatience with old modes, and deep questioning of national goals, a university would be unworthy of its name if it were not, as an academic society, reassessing its accomplishments and insufficiencies, re-examining its purposes, and redefining its future course. Aside from such fundamental matters as internal organization and the interrelationships of students, faculty, administration, and alumni, one of the most obvious sources of concern is the part the university should play in the wider community to which it belongs. What has it been doing, what is it doing, what should it be doing to help both community and nation in the practical business of finding solutions to urban distress and malaise, poverty, economic imbalance, racial inequality, and diseases of mind and body? Specifically, what is Harvard and what should Harvard be doing — and also, what should it not attempt to do — in these respects?

A multitude of questions had been directed to Harvard on this subject in the past year by members of the University, the alumni, and the general public. Therefore it seemed quite clear last spring to the Deans of the several Faculties and to me that circumstance had brought us to the point where we should attempt to make an inventory of all the different projects affecting Cambridge and Boston which are currently being conducted under Harvard auspices, not only to assure ourselves that they are worthy, helpful, and nonduplicative, but even more important, to determine whether we are going far enough, within our power, to marshal our special talents in helping with some of the crushing problems of this area.

Accordingly last May, I appointed a Committee on the University and the City to evaluate the University's effort, recommend new actions if necessary, determine an appropriate interrelationship of university and city, and particularly to try to say for a new era what a university is and ought to be.

This is the Committee's report, the fruit of a very busy summer of investigation and discussion, and an autumn of preparation and perfection. It does not pretend to be exhaustive. The Committee was instructed to advise the President and the Deans concerning the role Harvard ought to play in responding to urban issues both as a center of learning and an institution sharing with others an urban environment. Although the Committee studied in detail the University's relationship to Greater Boston, their Report focuses largely on Cambridge and largely on the role of Harvard's central Faculty, that of Arts and Sciences, which teaches and administers Harvard College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. But the reader can take for granted that most of the Committee's findings could apply equally well to Boston, while the inventory of urban projects amply reveals the practical concern of all the Faculties of the University and their students.

The report also makes almost no reference to the favorable (and unfavorable) economic impact which the University has on the Cambridge and Boston community in terms of purchasing power, tax income, cultural influence, and so on. This was not their purpose, but for readers who would like to examine this aspect in more detail there is available an updated version of my 1959 address to the service clubs of Cambridge.

Finally, the Committee has emphasized Harvard's role and responsibility throughout their report. This is in keeping with their directive, for the report is addressed to the Harvard community. It may be worth remarking that however large is Harvard's influence and potential for good or bad in Cambridge and Boston, the University is not alone in its effect and cannot proceed alone. What is required is a community-wide reassessment by all the Cambridge and Boston educational institutions, the financial and industrial enterprises and the city governments, cooperating with men and women of good will from among the general public to determine the appropriate goals and then work to effect the environmental changes which all of us know are needed. This is not a matter of lip service and public relations activity. It demands the best of all of us, and we should be enormously grateful to Professor Wilson and his Committee for indicating so clearly and thoughtfully how Harvard can continue and improve on its already considerable contribution.

Nathan M. Pusey

December 19, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ix

I. The Nature of the University 1

II. The Nature of the Community 11

III. University Degree Programs and the Community 15
  A. Undergraduate Programs
  B. Graduate Programs

IV. University Organization and Community Issues 23

V. University Policies Toward the Community 30
  A. Real Estate and Housing
  B. Planning
  C. Personnel
  D. Admissions
  E. Extension and Summer School Programs

VI. University Facilities and the Community 60

VII. University Finances and the Community 65

Appendix: Inventory of Community Projects 72

INTRODUCTION

THE COMMITTEE on the University and the City was created by President Pusey in May 1968, for the purpose of advising him and the Council of Deans on what response Harvard should make to the urban issues that confront universities both as centers of learning and as urban institutions. The Committee was composed of one faculty member from each school or faculty, plus the Director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard. Charles P. Whitlock, the President's Assistant for Civic and Governmental Relations, served as secretary to the Committee. Beginning in May, it met throughout the summer and fall; it consulted with a number of university officials, neighborhood organizations, and student groups; and it commissioned research on a number of subjects.

Its first task was to define an area of inquiry. One possibility was to explore and make recommendations about how the university might come to grips with those issues generally (and loosely) referred to as urban problems, with principal attention to questions of race, poverty, crime, disorder, and environment that currently are of special importance to the nation and of special interest to university members. Created, as it was, within a month following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., nothing would be more natural, one might suppose, than for the Committee to deal chiefly with the relationship of the university to the racial crisis then (as now) afflicting the nation. As its discussions progressed, however, the Committee found itself increasingly preoccupied with a different range of issues, less dramatic in their themes perhaps, but much closer to home. Instead of asking what contribution the university might make to the solution of urban problems generally, the Committee found itself asking what role the university should play as part of its own immediate urban environment.

There were several reasons for this emphasis. First, what are referred to as "urban" problems in fact transcend the boundaries of cities and include almost the full range of issues confronting an industrial society; to address urban problems is to address almost every domestic social and political question one can conceive. Second, every faculty of the university is now involved to some important degree in examining these issues in the United States, throughout the world, and in various historical periods. As a university-wide committee, we did not feel ourselves competent to evaluate the programs of teaching and research of the several faculties or the myriad scholarly endeavors of their individual members. Furthermore, we doubted whether centrally generated policies or recommendations respecting the direction of the work in the separate faculties are a proper or effective means for exercising leadership in a university. Finally, we are aware, as the tragic events at Columbia University in the spring of 1968 revealed, that whatever might be the quality of teaching and research, the position of the university as a local community institution could have the most profound effects on both the community and the institution. For all these reasons, we turned our attention to matters close to home and to issues on which the actions of the university as a corporate entity might have direct and immediate consequences. Accordingly, what follows is a report, preliminary in nature, on relationships between Harvard and the Greater Boston area with respect chiefly to those social and economic questions which, in our opinion or in the opinion of interested groups, are properly the concern of the university and its members.

Because we began our work at the end of the spring term and because we felt there was some urgency in completing at least an interim report, we have not been able to consult with as wide a range of interested parties as would have been the case had we met during the regular academic year or had we felt that these issues admit of a more leisurely treatment. We have, as a committee or as individuals delegated the task by the Committee, met with the following individuals and organizations:

In Harvard —
    The President
    The Treasurer
    The Administrative Vice President
    The Director of Personnel

- The Real Estate Officer
- The Planning Officer
- The Dean of Harvard College
- The Dean of Admissions in Harvard College
- The Executive Committee of Phillips Brooks House
- The Student-Faculty Advisory Council of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- The Director of University Extension
- The Director of the Summer School

Outside of Harvard —

- The Riverside Neighborhood Association
- The Housing Convention of the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc.
- The Cambridge Corporation
- The President of M.I.T.

Informal conversations were held with a large number of other persons, and written materials were received from a number of sources. We carried out three research programs: first, a study of the perceptions of Harvard as an employer held by organizations that attempt to find jobs for Boston Negroes; second, an opinion survey of a representative sample of the tenants in Harvard-owned buildings in Cambridge; and third, an inventory of the community-serving projects organized or staffed by Harvard University or any of its components.

Clearly, a wider range of consultations and more extensive research would have been possible if time had permitted and if *more student and faculty* groups had remained in Cambridge during the summer. In order neither to delay the release of information gathered and views formed during this period nor to deny our report the benefit of discussion at the earliest opportunity with all interested groups, we have decided to submit the present document as a preliminary report that is subject to revision. Our first recommendations to the President are that the document be given wide circulation within the university and the Cambridge and Boston communities, and that the Committee on the University and the City not be discharged of its duties but be allowed to remain in existence until the end of the present academic year for the purpose of receiving comments on this document, joining in discussions of it, and offering at the end of the year such revisions and additions as in its view seem appropriate.

There is nothing clearer to us than that no faculty group acting alone can give fully satisfactory answers to the questions we have addressed. At the same time, our experience is that discussion of these issues is more constructive if it proceeds in response to concrete proposals rather than on the basis of abstract or extemporaneous opinion.

The contents of this Report have in significant measure been shaped by the composition of this Committee. Seeking to examine Harvard's place in its urban environment, and composed of only one member from each faculty that makes up the university, we have felt we neither could nor should make proposals about the operations or curricula of the faculties. There are many questions one might ask: for example, about the role of the School of Education in assisting local public schools, or the problems of the Medical School in relation to local public and private hospitals and their medical care programs, or the relationship of the School of Design to the official and neighborhood groups that need professional planning and design help. But to attempt answers to these questions would have imposed on us an obligation that we could not have met to acquire an informed and competent understanding of the problems facing the several faculties. The result would have been a report, issued by a remote and unrepresentative body, containing exhortations of uncertain value bearing directly on matters that are (and ought to be) chiefly within the province of individual members of the university. We have emphasized instead university-wide problems and opportunities. What we have gained in breadth we may have lost in depth, but it seemed clear to us that the reason for appointing a university-wide committee was precisely to take the largest view.

The members of the Committee are unanimous in their belief that the several faculties ought to conduct their own reviews of their own programs of teaching, research, and service as they affect the community or as they might bear on the larger questions of social policy that face cities everywhere. Each faculty must arrive at its own sense of responsibility in this area. Largely for the purpose of stimulating and informing such discussions, this Committee has overseen the preparation of an Inventory of Community Projects of Harvard. This document, published as an appendix to this Report, is perhaps the first of its kind — it describes the community-serving activities of the various schools and departments of the University. No doubt the Inventory is incomplete, partly because it is difficult to distinguish a community-serving from a purely research project and partly because it is hard to decide in many cases which projects are "Harvard" efforts and which happen by accident to involve members of Harvard. As our Report makes clear, we hope that this Inventory can be revised and kept up to date. We were struck by the number and variety of service projects now underway, and we suspect that others will be impressed as well. Though we are not inclined to view the projects listed in the Inventory as meeting the university's responsibilities to the community, neither are we disposed to say that Harvard is "doing nothing."

In our efforts, we have had the unfailing co-operation of all members of the university administration to whom we have turned. Mr. Whitlock, as secretary to the Committee, put at our disposal the resources of the Office of Civic and Governmental Relations, and the President generously met our requests for funds. The Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard sponsored the study of tenant attitudes. Finally, the Committee acknowledges with gratitude the research assistance of Jill Halpern, Janet Marantz, Elizabeth Kendall, Suzanne Weaver, and Mitch Fishman, and the editorial assistance of David Cudhea and William Stiles.

The Committee on the University and the City

JAMES Q. WILSON, *Chairman*
(Faculty of Arts and Sciences)

FRANCIS M. BATOR
(Kennedy School of Government)

TJAARD G. HOMMES
(Divinity School)

MAURICE D. KILBRIDGE
(Business School)

SIDNEY S. LEE
(Medical School)

FRANK I. MICHELMAN
(Law School)

Daniel P. Moynihan
(Joint Center for Urban Studies)

George B. Thomas
(School of Education)

Wilhelm V. von Moltke
(School of Design)

Alonzo S. Yerby
(School of Public Health)

Charles P. Whitlock, *Secretary*

December 9, 1968

I

THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

THESE ARE troubled times. However reluctant one may be to make easy use of the term "crisis," a period in which riots and disorders have gripped our major cities, assassinations have altered the course of American politics, and universities and other institutions have been occupied by force is not likely to be called an era of good feelings. No one has yet given a full and wholly satisfactory account of the problems that beset not only our society but many others among the most civilized nations in the world. But the strongly felt and strongly pressed demands of the poor, the black, and the young (as well as the equally passionate concern of those who feel threatened by the poor, the black, and the young) seem to have one element in common: they express, in varying degrees, a loss of confidence in the legitimacy of institutions.

The university is one such institution whose right to behave as it traditionally has behaved is under question. The challenge is directed at many aspects of its nature; one of the most important, and the one to which this committee has been asked to turn its attention, is the relationship of the university to the community of which it is a part and, perhaps, to the problems of communities generally. One of the central purposes of the university, it is urged, should be to use its resources, talents, and energies to improve the lot of the poor, redress the grievances of the disadvantaged, and eliminate impediments to the full enjoyment of the benefits of an urban civilization. This is a serious charge, and we shall attempt to respond seriously and constructively.

To some, it may come as a surprise that no simple answer can be given. In its highest conception, the university stands as the enemy of injustice, smugness, and incivility. If injustice, smugness, and incivility abound, then it is only natural that the university should be in the forefront of those seeking to end them. But that is not so easy.

First of all, only by poetic license can we speak of "the" university. No university, and perhaps especially not Harvard, is a single organization; each is, rather, a collection of organizations that are separately led, separately funded, and separately inspired. The departments, faculties, students, schools, institutes, centers, museums, houses, administrators and groundskeepers that together make up "the" university are quasi-independent entities that seem, as someone has observed, to be "linked today only by the steam tunnels." And within many of those entities, professors jealously guard the right to determine, without interference from above or outside, the subjects to be offered, the degrees to be conferred, and the appointments to be made. "The" university can rarely have a single purpose, or act with a single will, because "the" university does not exist.

Some may see in this fact an indictment of the very nature of the institution. Such near-anarchic decentralization and autonomy, it may be argued, represent little more than a protection for privilege, a defense of professional self-interest, and a guarantee against change and relevance. No one who has participated in a faculty meeting would say that such charges are utterly without foundation, and few who have been students would deny the frustration that comes from vainly seeking a course of study no one has thought to offer or an idea no one is interested in pursuing. But academic decentralization is not in principle (nor, would we say, is it often in practice) a happy excuse for doing nothing or looking backward. It is a vital element of university life that required several centuries to achieve, and is now essential to the nature of a university.

What is that nature? An answer to that question provides a second reason why "mobilizing" the university to solve a problem is no easy (and perhaps no desirable) matter. The university — any university — has a distinctive competence, a special nature. That competence is *not* to serve as a government, or a consulting firm, or a polity, or a pressure group, or a family, or a kind of secularized church; it *is* to serve as a center of learning and free inquiry. Because of the devotion to learning, and a belief in the importance of ideas, people come together in universities; and it is an awareness, however dim and however cluttered by departmental and disciplinary boundaries, of that common devotion that makes the members of a university feel they are part of a community and not simply journeymen in some guild. At the June, 1968, commencement at Columbia University, when that great sister institution was searching most desperately for a restatement of its purpose, Professor Richard Hofstadter put the matter most directly. The university, he noted in his address,

> is suspended between its position in the external world, with all its corruption and evils and cruelties, and the splendid world of our imagination. The university does in fact perform certain mundane services of instruction and information to society — and there are those who think it should aspire to nothing more. It does in fact constitute a kind of free forum — and there are those who want to convert it primarily into a center of political action. But above these aspects of its existence stands its essential character as a center of free inquiry — a thing not to be sacrified for anything else. A university is not a service station. Neither is it a political society, nor a meeting place for political societies. With all its limitations and failures, and they are invariably many, it is the best and most benign side of our society insofar as that society aims to cherish the human mind.

But cannot learning and free inquiry be made more relevant to the issues of the moment — issues which, given the rage and violence into which they sometimes erupt, hardly seem trivial or ephemeral? Indeed, some such inquiries can be and are "relevant" in the sense of being germane to the practical and contemporary problems of our society. The training of teachers, doctors, and lawyers is, or ought to be, pertinent to the situations such persons are likely to encounter. Nor should we be content with preparing students professionally for those experiences that will come to them as a matter of course. A truly relevant education would make them aware not only of the experiences they are likely to encounter but also of those about which they *ought* to be concerned; and it would stimulate them to seek out opportunities for putting their special training at the disposal of those clients and institutions most in need of their help and most likely to benefit from their skills.

But if relevance in the sense of "useful" or "topical" is one test of the kind of learning to be found in some faculties, it is not the only test even in those places and may not be a test at all in other faculties. The education provided in professional schools would be defective and incomplete if it did not include — indeed, if it were not organized around — a concern for the central theoretical issues of the discipline. But the work of the historian, the philosopher, the literary critic, or the mathematician cannot easily be judged by standards of practicality and thus the efforts of such persons cannot easily be "mobilized" to deal with urgent social issues.

In a larger sense, however, their work, and the work of all members of a university, is relevant, if by relevant we mean not useful or topical but developing new information and raising fundamental questions of purpose and value in such a way as to illumine contemporary problems. In this larger view — and it is precisely the function of universities to take the larger, longer, and more critical view — nothing could be more relevant than a course on the meaning of justice, or the nature of political obligation, or the emergence of liberty in the history of Europe. Whether in a particular course the emphasis falls more heavily on underlying and often theoretical questions or on the relationship of these questions to concrete issues and problems will depend largely on the taste and interest of the individual scholar. Nothing would be more destructive of the life of a university than to insist that contemporary concerns always take precedence over historical or theoretical knowledge. Nor do we believe the balance between these two elements of "relevant" knowledge is at Harvard so badly one-sided as to require major changes in the processes of learning in the university. In recent years, the concern for "urban" issues has widened and deepened. It would have been rather easy to meet this demand by hiring persons, however uncertain their abilities, to offer "relevant" new courses, or by converting existing courses, however doubtful the preparation of students and faculty, into "urban" courses. That path was resisted, and wisely. Instead, the faculties have agreed that persons interested in applying (where possible) the methods of their respective disciplines to contemporary issues should be sought for actively, but that such persons must first pass the same tests of competence as those who attach less importance to a particular social issue.

While mindful of the gains of certain disciplines in finding ways of applying their skills to policy questions (the work of economists dealing with national income is an important case in point), we must still conclude that many of the chief problems confronting our society are not ones that will yield readily, if at all, to the kinds of knowledge university intellectuals can produce. The development and testing of hypotheses about human behavior is slow and difficult. The results are often available (if at all) only after the time for choice has passed, and they are frequently of a kind that makes them inadequate guides to action. We have studied intergroup relations for decades but we have learned little about how racist attitudes can be changed, except perhaps in small, experimental groups. We have investigated urban politics, but we have no expert advice to offer a mayor wishing to know how to raise more tax revenue from a reluctant electorate. Recently a large number of social scientists were enlisted in the efforts of a national commission seeking to discover the causes and cures for civil disorder. The experts no doubt made many useful contributions to that report and many of the programs they devised should no doubt be enacted, but the experts will be among the first to admit that they cannot say authoritatively why we have disorders and what might prevent them. The limits to university expertise with respect to social issues arise from the very nature of the university and the advancement of learning, and are not generally the result of either disinterest or stupidity. The intellectual disciplines are concerned with discovering what is generally true about human affairs, not what is true in the specific case; with explaining tendencies and uniformities, not particular circumstances or unusual events; with simplifying our ways of describing or measuring complex situations, not with remaining *au courant* about the details of current affairs. Occasionally, such intellectual knowledge is of value, but just as often it is not relevant to the particular political judgments that are vital to the direction of public policy. Perhaps the special talents of academic intellectuals are best employed in evaluating after the fact, rather than in predicting before the fact, the consequences of public policy. Even the best social scientists rarely answer, expertly, a question put to them by a public official; typically, they tell the public official that he is asking the wrong question.

But just as it is a mistake to think of the university as a centrally led organization of problem-solvers, so also would it be a mistake to think of the university as nothing more than a casual assemblage of scholars and students contemplating the nature of man and the advancement of knowledge. An important part of the university is the professional schools and those attendant disciplines that are necessarily involved in their environment and therefore inevitably involved in the problems of that environment. If students of medicine, law, education, city planning, public health, business, and other professions can only be taught by giving them part of the city on which to practice, it is appropriate to ask what they intend to give back to the city in return. If the values these students are taught to cherish — values of compassion, equality, dignity and intellectual integrity — are systematically violated in parts of the society wherein they will make their living, it is only right that they be made to feel slightly uncomfortable about the prospect of seeking that living in ways that permit these problems to be neglected.

Indeed, in many ways it is the students who are most keenly aware of these issues and who most clearly insist that the faculty pay them heed. The student cannot be expected to bring to the college or the professional and graduate schools only that part of his personality that seeks wisdom; he brings all parts of his personality, including his concern for public affairs, for the nature of society, and for the value of the tasks he is expected to perform. We — the professors — have been told in the most emphatic ways of the depth of that concern, and we ignore it at our peril. The deep and legitimate interest of students in community affairs and public service cannot be treated simply as an extracurricular matter, for it affects how they view and experience their own education and how they respond to the teaching and scholarship the university offers them. We do a disservice to the students if we should respond to these needs by organizing discussions, courses, and programs in which facile opinions are exchanged, celebrities interviewed, and slogans propounded as if they were knowledge. But we do as great a disservice if we should pretend that the urgent interests of the students can be left wholly to student organizations, extramural programs, and demonstrations "elsewhere."

In addition to the responsibility for quality professional training that recognizes the symbiotic relationship between school and community and the need to respond reasonably to the concerns of students, there is a third sense in which the university is an institution, located in two cities. It employs thirteen thousand people, spends $170 million a year, occupies about 175 acres of land in each city, is worth over a billion dollars, and attracts to itself thousands of students, faculty, administrators, and university-oriented persons who seek housing for themselves, schooling for their children, and subjects on which to do research. The annual budget of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences alone is more than the combined budgets of the City of Cambridge and the Cambridge school system. And the urban environment in which Harvard finds itself (somewhat to its surprise, having been founded when Harvard Yard was carved out of a cattle pasture) is of a special quality that in important though mysterious ways affects the quality of education the university offers. Diverse and heterogeneous, the area contains competing life styles, a range of visual prospects, and a microcosm of the larger society and its issues.

No institution of this size and with this purpose can be neutral about its environment. If it should act vigorously to secure land, erect buildings, and shape events, it will impose, however laudable its intentions, its preferences on others who may not share them. If it should be passive and let events take their course, it will implicitly choose a certain kind of environment — one, perhaps, in which all Cambridge slowly becomes like Harvard and M.I.T. until we find that we are no longer an urban university but one which has allowed there to grow up around itself a kind of inner-city suburb with a single life style, carried on by professors, students, psychiatrists, and the executives of electronics and consulting firms. Perhaps that is the environment we wish to have, or we should have, but we cannot pretend that we may remain neutral on the issue.

If a false sense of neutrality were ever possible, it is no longer so in an era of intense community and neighborhood self-awareness. Through elected and self-appointed leaders, by petition and by protest, singly and collectively, the citizens of our urban environment expect the university to act as a responsible and enlightened landlord, employer, and neighbor. Little more than a legitimate concern for its own self-interest will lead the university to reflect seriously and act positively on the obligations of its urban citizenship. The community is no more wholly extramural than the students are wholly intramural. The legitimate grievances of community groups will increasingly be amplified and articulated by students and faculty, who share their concerns partly because they share their problems and partly because the education the university has helped provide them leads them to conclude that these concerns are morally right.

Primarily in the professional schools, but to some extent in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the combined impact of new client groups, new career goals, and shifting faculty and student intellectual interests has produced a proliferation of community-serving programs. The Inventory of Community Projects undertaken by the Committee uncovered more than 160 programs in which there is some Harvard sponsorship of, or official participation in, an enterprise with a significant local public service component. It is difficult to do more than guess the dollar cost of these projects but it is possible to say that a substantial number are addressed not simply to "the community" but to the more disadvantaged part of the community. A summary of these projects, listed by faculty, is contained in the appendix to this Report. A few of the more important projects are:

— A Business School project to train Negroes in Roxbury interested in becoming businessmen and another to help the Boston Model Cities Board create an "urban development corporation."

— The Urban Field Service of the Graduate School of Design, which provides professional planning and design assistance to community organizations and neighborhood groups, with special attention to those in low-income areas.

— The Field Education program of the Divinity School, under which nearly one hundred students are assigned to more than thirty community projects as part of their regular degree program.

— The Educational Collaborative of Greater Boston, created by seven public and parochial school systems and the School of Education to provide staff services and consultation for groups concerned with development of urban-suburban collaboration. Also, the Harvard-Boston Summer Program, which runs an experimental summer school and a teacher training program in low-income areas of Boston.

— Phillips Brooks House, in the College, which operates over a dozen programs in community organization and service, chiefly in Cambridge, in which several hundred undergraduates participate.

— The intern programs of the Institute of Politics in the Kennedy School of Government, through which undergraduates are assigned, with financial aid, as participants in various government agencies or political campaigns.

— Projects of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard involving, among other things, assisting in developing plans to reduce racial imbalance in Boston public schools and in preparing programs for the Cambridge Model Cities application.

— The Community Legal Assistance Office, the Legal Aid Bureau, and the Voluntary Defenders of the Harvard Law School, involving in total more than two hundred law students who contribute time to assist local residents with various legal problems.

— The Medical School's new plan for prepaid, comprehensive health services to be provided in the Boston area in collaboration with several associated teaching hospitals and the insurance industry. Already deeply involved in providing medical care in Boston, the Medical School is also participating in new service programs in Roxbury, Charlestown, and Cambridge.

— The Harvard Commission on Relations with the Black Community, composed of students, faculty, and staff, formed to develop new programs for training disadvantaged students and providing health services in black areas.

— The Harvard Center for Community Health and Medical Care, sponsored by the School of Public Health and the Medical School, directed at improving the delivery of medical services in the community.

No doubt some of these programs will experience great difficulties; a few may, in time, be judged unwise or impractical. We suspect that those community programs that endure will be those that manage to link service activities to the central intellectual questions of the appropriate discipline, so that each component enriches the other. In some cases, however, no fair test of their intellectual and service potential may be possible, owing to the fact that some were formed in ignorance of, or perhaps even at cross-purposes to, similar programs in other faculties, or were launched with insufficient knowledge of the likely community response. As we shall argue later, there is a need for greater inter-faculty consultation on service programs.

The first responsibility of the administrators of a university is to enhance the capacity of the institution and its members to engage in the advancement of learning and the conservation and improvement of culture. But achieving this objective requires today more than ever before that the university (or its principal officers) take seriously into account the concern within and without the university for the consequences of the institution's behavior on those who live near it or are affected by it. The principle of academic decentralization is that best suited to the pursuit of the university's chief purpose, but to sustain that decentralization and thus that pursuit requires that the university review its degree programs, reconsider its relations with student organizations and interests, and improve its capacity to make a timely and constructive response to the demands placed on it by the community. The growth in the institution's ability to deal with its environment has not kept pace with the growth in its ability to offer courses, conduct research, or confer degrees. While the university benefits from decentralization, it suffers from dispersion.

Nothing is easier, of course, than for a committee of professors to tell deans and administrators that they must change their ways. The history of universities has in one sense been a story of a steady increase in the willingness of the faculty to make demands and a steady decrease in the ability of the administration to do much about them. We are aware of this problem; indeed, we have begun our discussion of university-community relations with a consideration of the nature of the university, rather than the problems of cities, in order to remind ourselves that not everything we may wish is easily done or even possible. But we take comfort in the fact that the President himself recognizes not only the limits to action, but the need for action. As Mr. Pusey remarked in June, 1968, to the Associated Harvard Alumni meeting in the Tercentenary Theatre:

> The manifold and weighty expectations that now confront universities may be too many and too urgent for them. It is almost certain that not all of them can be met. It is also conceivable that some of them are misguided, and should not be met. But however wrong or disproportionate they may be in specific instances or in aggregate, in the present condition of our cities we cannot begin by callously ignoring the call they now make to us.

II

THE NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY

When we compare the urban environment of Harvard with that of certain other large universities, we find cause neither for smugness nor despair. The precincts of the university, both in Cambridge and Boston, touch on the neighborhoods of the poor, both black and white. The Personnel Office seeks to recruit employees from a labor force that contains many persons who, owing to inadequate education, lack of skills, or a steady exposure to the barriers of racial discrimination, are chronically unemployed or underemployed. Within walking distance of Harvard are public facilities — schools, hospitals, and recreation areas — that are dilapidated, undermanned, and poorly equipped. Congestion and ugliness are not hard to find — they lie a dozen steps from the entrance to the Yard or to the Medical School.

We are concerned that the problems exist, but we take hope from the fact that here, unlike some other cities, they do not seem insurmountable. Compared with universities in many of the largest cities, we find ourselves in an area with a relatively smaller stock of dilapidated housing. The poor, black and white, are here in the tens of thousands, but not in the hundreds of thousands. Signs of vitality and change are evident in the centers of Boston and Cambridge, and people from all over the country and the world continue to come here and seek to live, not on the periphery, but in the center. Though blight occasionally and congestion frequently detract from its enjoyment, the visual environment is still among the most pleasing to be found anywhere. We can still say that people come to Harvard not in spite of its environment but partly because of it.

Harvard has a responsibility for helping improve that environment, and the opportunities open to people in it, in part because Harvard's presence is a significant determinant of the shape of that environment and the extent of those opportunities. We cannot say that the problems of the public schools are no concern of ours; to some degree the schools are what they are because the faculty and teaching fellows of the university have increasingly refused to send their own children to them. We cannot say that the health of the community is simply a "public" problem, because Harvard, through its involvement with many hospitals and various public and private health agencies in this area, is to some extent responsible for the quality of the health programs. We cannot assume that local housing problems are someone else's affair if, by attracting more and more students, we have contributed to driving up rents and breaking up old neighborhoods.

Though the distinction between "Harvard" and "non-Harvard" citizens of Boston or Cambridge seems real enough to many of those involved, in fact both groups share a common set of problems. The rising demand for living space and the increase in the cost of housing that has resulted from it have created difficulties for everyone, whoever his employer. In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences alone, the number of graduate students increased from 1,338 in 1938 to 3,030 in 1966, while the number of tenured faculty members increased from 175 to 330. Increasingly, members of the university have found it necessary or desirable to look outside Cambridge for housing. Whereas almost every Arts and Sciences professor in 1900 lived within the city (and indeed, close to the university), by 1966 less than half did. Graduate students and junior faculty especially find it difficult to acquire reasonably priced housing in Cambridge or in many parts of Boston. During the same period, many middle-class families with no Harvard connection joined the exodus to the suburbs. Those who have remained behind, Harvard and non-Harvard alike, have had to face a steady inflation in housing prices and at best an uneven level of public services. But though the two groups face common problems, this fact has not produced a sense of common interests, owing perhaps to differences in life style and demeanor.

Harvard has responsibilities toward the Harvard and non-Harvard community, but these responsibilities are not best met by drawing up a list of "community problems" and then urging the President and Fellows, or the deans, to "do something." From time to time — as when a great civil rights leader is senselessly murdered — the instinct to act in this manner becomes almost irresistible. But it would be a mistake. Harvard cannot solve most of the problems that face us, nor can it always act collectively to make a contribution toward their solution. It is too easy to arouse false hopes and to stimulate unrealizable expectations. There have been many calls to action of late; those who issue them are often found, within a short time, returning to their private pursuits.

Further, and perhaps most important, deciding *what* to do cannot be done by Harvard, or some part of Harvard, acting unilaterally. In every area to which this committee has turned its attention, there are already programs underway, organizations formed, spokesmen selected, conflicts apparent. Just as "the" university does not exist, so "the" community does not exist. We impinge upon many communities and some of them — perhaps most — are deeply suspicious of Harvard's intentions and capacities. No master plan for community action can or should be devised by Harvard alone, because any action requires Harvard first to work out, carefully and over time, a subtle and complex set of relationships with existing organizations and existing programs.

The goals that the many neighborhoods, organizations, and leaders seek are, like the goals sought by the many parts of Harvard, partially in conflict. Some feel we should increase the supply of faculty and student housing so that the pressure on the city's housing supply would be eased, but to do this we would first have to acquire land in the community, with the likely result that the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing for other Cambridge and Boston residents would be further decreased. Some feel we should hire more non-Harvard residents, especially the poor and most especially the black poor; others feel that the cost of education has risen so sharply that it is more important than ever to provide employment for students and student wives. Some wish the admissions offices to reserve more places and more financial aid for local high school students (especially from poor neighborhoods) who have not excelled; but others wish us to emphasize recruiting such students nationally rather than locally; and still others hope we will increase the amount of financial aid available to the best local graduates as an incentive for students to excel. Some take "community problems" to be synonymous with the problems of Roxbury;

others note that, while the difficulties facing that area, where few whites live, are great, virtually the same range of problems face Somerville, where no blacks live.

In the remainder of this report, then, we shall not attempt to devise a "comprehensive program," nor shall we assume that Harvard can or should function as the government of Boston or Cambridge, nor shall we ignore the large number of community-serving programs — many begun and led by various parts of the university — already in existence. What we shall do is this: First, we shall indicate how the primary task of the university, the encouragement of learning, can be improved to take account of the changing needs and interests of students and faculty alike with respect to urban affairs. Second, we shall recommend ways whereby the university can increase its capacity to act not only in response to, but also in anticipation of, the demands and concerns of the neighborhoods on which Harvard impinges. Third, we shall suggest a number of policies that we believe should guide the central administration and the leadership of the various schools and faculties as they make decisions regarding employment, real estate, admissions, planning, and university facilities. Finally, we shall offer recommendations regarding the financing of community-service projects and investments in neighborhood endeavors.

III

UNIVERSITY DEGREE PROGRAMS AND THE COMMUNITY

In our conversations with students, we were struck by the breadth and depth of their interest in urban affairs and urban studies, and by their restlessness about the extent to which existing program and disciplinary boundaries seem to restrict students from pursuing that interest. It is necessary to view such interests cautiously, for changing educational programs to suit a temporary rather than an enduring intellectual concern would be a great mistake. The existing disciplines, though they at times seem to represent an archaic and misleading definition of intellectual life, preserved only by inertia and departmental jealousies, are nevertheless to an important degree necessary means for organizing knowledge and insuring that academic decentralization does not lead to academic anarchy. We are also aware that universities have had earlier experiences with the demand for new fields of study, and that these were not invariably happy ones. Shortly after the Second World War, the interest in international studies and regional studies was at least as great as the current preoccupation with urban studies. In response to the discontent with the confining limits of disciplines and departments, special committees on international relations and programs on Soviet studies, Asian studies, Near Eastern studies, and Southeast Asian studies were formed. Though some were highly successful, and many played an important role in stimulating new research and prodding traditional departments, in some universities it was found that such interdepartmental efforts could not be institutionalized. They were at best an adjunct to, rather than a substitute for, the conventional undergraduate and graduate degree programs. It proved almost impossible to shift the primary loyalties and career interests of faculty away from their departments and disciplines and it proved difficult in some places to maintain high intellectual standards. Finally, many encountered serious financial problems.

We believe that it would be unwise to take the present interest in urban studies as sufficient justification to make radical changes in existing university organization or curriculum. At the same time, we believe that much can be done to make existing programs more flexible and better adapted to the proven interests of students and faculty alike. Furthermore, we note that there are a number of student activities already underway, and of established vitality, that involve the students in urban affairs but in a manner that unfortunately isolates them from the academic life of the university. We believe it is important to bring the service activities of students into a closer relationship with their intellectual activities, so that service will be informed by knowledge and instruction will be tested against experience. Finally, we believe that the existing doctoral program most specifically related to urban studies — the PH.D. in City and Regional Planning — must be revised and possibly supplemented to improve the training of teachers and researchers who will address themselves to urban affairs. We note that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has approved a proposal to suspend admissions to the PH.D in City and Regional Planning and to request the President to appoint a Standing Committee to develop a new doctoral program in public policy. In a section that follows, we offer to that Committee some considerations that we believe should inform any new program in urban studies.

A. Undergraduate Programs

Though we understand the reasons why a university should be reluctant to encourage the proliferation of interdepartmental degrees and programs, we believe that there is both precedent and reason for some modest experimentation with an undergraduate concentration in Urban Studies. The experience of the concentration in History and Literature indicates that not every such venture is doomed to failure. Furthermore, there is now offered a considerable variety of courses in urban studies (especially in the Departments of Social Relations, Government, and Economics and in the Graduate School of Design and the Graduate School of Education) to which undergraduates are or can be admitted. A very approximate and no doubt incomplete count indicates that at least thirty such courses are now described in the catalogue.

Simply permitting students to announce that they are concentrating in Urban Studies and then encouraging them to roam among these course offerings would be a mistake, however. There must be some central intellectual direction and some common intellectual experience. We are frank to say that we do not know whether that common intellectual experience can be defined. "Urban studies" is an almost boundless subject; in principle, anything that happens to people who live in cities could be included. Furthermore, there is no recognized discipline with that title to the advancement of which a serious group of scholars regularly devote their efforts. Often what people study under the guise of "urban affairs" might better be studied under the rubric "problems of an industrial society," for the chief concerns frequently appear to be with questions of poverty, race, and education, and these issues, while of special importance in cities, are no more distinctively "urban" than the problem of malnutrition is distinctively rural or the problem of government organization is distinctively American.

These difficulties do not, in our eyes, foreclose the matter. We believe that a serious effort should be made to devise a more flexible program to accommodate the genuine interest of students (and of much of the faculty) in focussing attention in the college on the nature and problems of urban life. There are several alternatives. One would be a Committee on Urban Studies to administer a new concentration in this field. A second would be to offer an Urban Studies specialization within the Social Studies program. There may be others.

We recommend that the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences appoint a committee to consider ways to meet the undergraduate interest in urban studies, including (but not limited to) an undergraduate concentration in that subject. *If* such a concentration seems desirable, we urge the committee to give special consideration to three factors. First, it should insure that there is sufficient faculty interest so that the program would be administered with the active assistance and support of professors committed to, and not merely willing to permit, such a program. Second, we stress the need for a regular tutorial program as part of any such concentration in order to provide focus and continuity. This tutorial should be offered in the sophomore, junior, and senior years. Third, we commend to the committee the possibility that alternatives to the senior honors thesis be offered. One such alternative would be to devise and carry out a field project; another would be an evaluative report on an existing project.

This last point raises a more general issue. Students in increasing numbers wish field work on behalf of a client in the community to be regarded by the various faculties as a legitimate part of their education. The professional schools, of course, have for varying periods not only allowed but in many cases required such work. If this desire had suddenly come upon the members of the university, we would be skeptical of encouraging it. To many persons, "field work" might be no more than a few afternoons playing basketball with slum children. The possibilities of superficiality and low standards are evident. But the student concern is neither sudden nor untested by experience. One example (there are many) is in the work of Phillips Brooks House.

One of the oldest undergraduate organizations and certainly the largest, PBH has several hundred members at work on fourteen different programs that involve community action and client rehabilitation. The Cambridge Educational Advancement Project, funded by a federal grant to PBH, involves six related programs that together are designed to find and encourage talented young people in Cambridge and help prepare them for college or jobs. Tutoring, guidance, community organization, enrichment classes, and recreation programs are developed by PBH volunteers with the substantial participation of those who are to benefit. Under other projects financed by money PBH raises from its own sources, Harvard and Radcliffe students work in the Columbia Point housing project, in Roxbury classrooms, among the Spanish-speaking residents of the South End, and in mental hospitals and prisons.

In a report to the Committee on the University and the City, the officers of PBH urged in the strongest terms that ways be found whereby this field of work could be related more closely to college instruction and research. Far from wishing to "do good" in their free hours as an escape from classroom obligations, far from seeking to avoid the difficult intellectual questions that such work raises, the students themselves wish to assume those obligations and confront those questions. They write:

> University officials have often commented on the educational value of the volunteer experience at PBHA, but it appears to us that volunteering at PBHA, under the present arrangement of courses and majors, is severely limited in its potential educational value. It is essential to make the volunteer experience more *intellectually* educational. To work in a housing project without any knowledge of the social economic, philosophical, political, and historical factors which created and perpetuated housing projects, is to be as myopic as the person who theorizes about society and its problems without ever having confronted most of them in an environment like a housing project.*

B. Graduate Programs

We have considered whether there is a need for a new, multidisciplinary graduate program to provide advanced professional and scholarly training for students who wish to prepare themselves for work on urban issues or for research on those issues not easily studied from the perspective of a single discipline. We have been aware that many proposals of this kind are now being discussed and that every school and faculty in the university has growing and legitimate interest in participating in any such venture. Indeed, before our report was submitted, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences already had taken action on a proposal to suspend admissions to the present "urban" degree — the PH.D. in City and Regional Planning — and to request the appointment of a Standing Committee to devise and administer a new doctoral program in this field. The recommendations that follow, therefore, do not pretend to state a curriculum or to outline a program, but rather are offered as guidelines to such committees as may be charged with taking responsibility for "urban" programs.

Urban studies at the doctoral level face the same difficulties described above with respect to undergraduate education. Indeed, the very breadth of interest in urban affairs to be found at Harvard and other universities is testimony to how difficult it is to set boundaries around the subject. Every graduate and professional school carries out instruction and research on policy issues that might be called "urban"; indeed, it is difficult to think of many policy questions that do not affect the lives of people living in cities. Efforts in the past (as with bureaus of municipal research) to find an intellectual subject that could be made coterminous with the boundaries of cities have generally failed; invariably, almost all aspects of the larger society had to be considered. A doctoral program must have a central intellectual direction and reflect a common intellectual experience. The word "urban" provides neither that direction nor that experience, especially since most persons mean by "urban problems" not simply (or primarily) the land uses and governmental policies of cities, but the whole range of social, economic, aesthetic, and political issues that afflict an industrial society. We conclude that "urban studies" is not an intellectually satisfactory definition of a field and thus should not be the label for a new doctoral program.

---

* A Report from the Executive Committee of Phillips Brooks House Association to the President's Committee on the University and the City (August, 1968), p. 8.

At the same time, there is no mistaking the urgency with which certain public problems are being addressed, or the demand by young men and women for an educational program that will equip them for a career in dealing with these problems. These persons are, in general, of two kinds. First there are those who wish to be lawyers, economists, doctors, educators, or the like, but who in addition wish to acquire supplementary training outside their professional school in order to have a wider perspective on the issues and a fuller range of skills with which to analyze those issues. These persons seek the appropriate professional degree but want also a complementary program that will give them courses in, and a degree in, some parallel field. They wish the first professional degree (such as the LL.B., M.D., M.C.P., or M.B.A.) to be part of some joint program with (usually) an arts and sciences discipline (such as economics, political science or social relations). We believe that we ought to regularize the process by which, and the terms under which, professional-school students can participate, at the masters' or doctoral level, in joint degree programs.

The second group are those who do not wish to become lawyers, doctors, planners, or the like but instead wish to enter directly into a doctoral program that will emphasize policy analysis and that will prepare each of them for a career in government, in an organization such as RAND or the Urban Institute, or in a university post that stresses policy rather than discipline. They wish to acquire competence in analytical methods and also considerable familiarity with one or two substantive policy fields.

We believe that these interests can and should be accommodated in a new graduate program at the masters' and doctoral level. Though the content of that program must be left to others, we recommend that it conform to the following requirements:

First, the curriculum should be based on equipping the student with a set of analytical skills, through training as rigorous as that now received by students in the regular graduate and professional schools. One such set of skills that is likely to be in great demand will be economics and related quantitative methods. But other core disciplines might also be chosen: sociology, emphasizing demography, survey analysis, and social structure; government, emphasizing empirical and normative political theory; or operations research and statistical decision-making techniques.

Second, each student should be required to offer one or perhaps two substantive policy fields. Every graduate and professional school could offer, and appears to be interested in offering, such a specialization. Among the more obvious ones are criminal law and the administration of justice, urban design, transportation and land-use planning, urban public health, and education. There are many others, and they need not be drawn from conventionally "urban" fields.

Third, the degree should not be called a PH.D. in Urban Studies, but be given a more general and thus more enduring and flexible title. One possibility (there are no doubt others) is a PH.D. in Planning and Policy Analysis.

Fourth, this program should not be administered by an interfaculty committee or other independent organization specially created for the purpose. Though we are prepared to believe that committees are competent to do some things, and even occasionally competent to administer a degree, the dangers of diffuseness, of lowered standards, and of minimal faculty involvement in the field we are now discussing are so great that we believe it is especially important to provide the degree with a firm institutional base. Though the doctor-of-philosophy degree can only be conferred on the recommendation of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, there is both precedent and reason for settling the administration of the degree on some policy-oriented, multi-disciplinary faculty that would in turn make recommendations to Arts and Sciences. We believe the Kennedy School of Government is such a faculty. Its members have a common interest in policy questions; it now includes among its faculty representatives of many (but not all) the professional schools concerned with "urban" issues; it has the resources of the Institute of Politics to facilitate field work and internship; and it has had many years of experience in administering, on behalf of Arts and Sciences, the PH.D. in Political Economy and Government. We recommend that the new PH.D. in Planning and Policy Analysis become the operational responsibility of the Kennedy School and that the membership in that School, or on the Standing Committee created to supervise this degree, include representatives of all relevant professional schools. It is particularly important that schools with a long-standing and active interest in this area, such as the Graduate School of Design, be included in the management of the degree.

Finally, we are alert to the possibility that, unless precautions are taken, such a degree program will be inundated with students, causing both an undesirable increase in class size and an objectionable lowering of standards. We urge whatever body is charged with this program to exercise the greatest care in this regard, by keeping the number of students admitted very small, by setting admission standards as high as those for other doctoral degrees, and by allowing no shortcuts in either the analytical core curriculum or the substantive policy fields. If anything, it should be harder to get this degree than any other; if anything, we should prefer to exasperate students with high standards and tough entrance requirements than to disappoint them with a second-class education and thus a second-class degree.

IV

UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION AND COMMUNITY ISSUES

In almost every area to which our attention has turned, we have repeatedly encountered one fundamental problem: the absence of some central authority within the university that is fully equipped to respond to demands, anticipate problems, formulate policies, and co-ordinate university efforts with respect to matters that implicate the community. There is, in our opinion, no change more important than improving the organizational capacity of the university to deal with its environment.

Though all universities are highly decentralized organizations, and Harvard especially so, they increasingly are facing demands that would require them to act as if they were monolithic, centrally led organizations. This is true not only of those demands uttered by neighborhood and citizen groups, but of many of those demands pressed by the federal government, by numerous public and private agencies, and by students and faculty members, all of whom expect "the" university to help solve a variety of current problems.

Certain important functions are performed by the central administration. Officers of the university directly responsible to the President and Fellows receive and invest monies; recruit, test, and screen applicants for non-teaching jobs; acquire and manage real estate; devise and plan university-wide construction projects; and represent "the" university before civic and governmental groups at the local, state, and federal level. Harvard has taken justifiable pride in the fact that this central staff has been kept remarkably small despite an awesome growth in the size and budget of the university. The pressures toward the proliferation of offices and the bureaucratization of central functions have been successfully resisted. The President is served by only three assistants; there is only one Vice-President, and he has no assistant; real estate is managed by one man; there is no public relations officer, only a news office; no provost or academic vice-president intervenes between the President and his deans; and investment decisions are made in great part by one man (the Treasurer) and his staff, and not by a committee.

But though the central staff has been kept small, its capacity to act quickly and in unison in response to specific inquiries and demands has not thereby been enhanced. Furthermore, the development of positive programs that anticipate such pressures has not been pressed. Partly this has been deliberate — it has evidently been the wish of the central administration for many years to avoid domination of the community of which Harvard is a part. Real estate acquisitions have been confined, for the most part, to those deemed essential to the instructional and research needs of the university. The university has tried to avoid playing an aggressive role in local public affairs. But partly the apparent lack of response to community issues has been unintended, the result of the fact that the offices whose activities affect the community are small, independent, and without substantial and continuous central direction. No person with line authority other than the President himself (and the Corporation) has responsibility for deciding policies toward the community.

To illustrate the problem, suppose a community group becomes concerned over the real estate activities of the university — activities that appear to be generating speculative buying and selling and inflationary pressures on rentals and land costs. Suppose that group wishes to discover the intentions of the university, or to protest the practices of the university as a landlord, or to devise some program that will stabilize a neighborhood upon which the university touches. The group will first call the Office of Civic and Governmental Relations and will elicit some information, but it will also learn that this office has no authority in the matter and only advises the President. It may then visit the Planning Office, but it will discover that this office is under the authority of the director of Buildings and Grounds and in any case seems preoccupied with project design, consultation with various schools regarding their building needs, and rendering certain architectural services to parts of the university. The group may then approach the Real Estate Office but it will there be informed that this office (in fact, one or two men) is chiefly responsible for buying and selling land on the recommendation of the Planning Committee (a semi-official group of planners, assistant deans, and administrators which, though it meets weekly, is not a formally recognized committee of the university) and the approval of the Corporation (the official governing body of the university that receives reports from the President but does not meet with other persons either from inside or outside the university). And the management of land is not the duty of the Real Estate Office but of a private firm. Hunneman and Company, that serves as the university's agent. At no point in this process is the community group likely to encounter a person who is prepared to tell them what the university's policies are and who is authorized to make commitments on behalf of the university.

We have observed a number of instances in which the questions and demands of individuals and groups in the community, going unanswered or unmet, produced frustration and bitterness. Not all their demands, of course, can or should be met, and therefore some disappointment is both inevitable and (from the university's point of view) proper. But to the disappointment produced by saying "no," the university has sometimes added that produced by saying nothing.

Specifically, the university is insufficiently staffed and inadequately organized to respond in a deliberate, timely, and constructive fashion to community demands. Such a response we suggest, is possible only if some central agency within the university is given the responsibility, status, and staff sufficient to speak authoritatively for the university on community matters. The Office of Civic and Governmental Relations, having only advisory functions, cannot perform this role adequately, and many, if not most, of the offices whose activities affect the community, and whose behavior therefore often elicits community reactions, view their responsibilities primarily in terms of the internal management needs of the university.

We therefore propose that a new position — that of Vice President for External Affairs — be created, coequal in status and authority with the Administrative Vice President. The Vice President for External Affairs would have line authority over the Real Estate Office, the Planning Office, and the Office of Civic and Governmental Relations. In addition, a new agency would be created and made responsible to the new Vice President — a clearinghouse for university-community activities.

Through the Real Estate Office, the Vice President for External Affairs would have responsibility both for the acquisition of real estate and for monitoring the management of real estate occupied by tenants. The work of the university's real estate management agent would be scrutinized and reviewed by this office and complaints from tenants not resolved by the agent could be appealed to this office.

The Office of Civic and Governmental Affairs would be responsible for maintaining liaison with community groups and public officials and for insuring a regular flow of information to and from the university. By placing the OCGR under the new Vice President, we do not intend any change in the existing mechanisms for managing Harvard's relations with the federal government. Specifically, the Office of Research Contracts would remain the responsibility of the Administrative Vice President.

We believe it is essential that both the Real Estate Office and the Office of Civic and Governmental Relations be combined under one officer. Real estate practices generate more community demands and concerns than any other activity of the central administration; the Office of Civic and Governmental Relations must often deal with the consequences of those practices by explaining them and, on occasion, attempting (through persuasion) to alter them. Inevitably, the persons in charge of these two offices will, because of the nature of their tasks, develop somewhat different perspectives. One will be concerned (quite properly) about meeting, at the lowest possible cost, the land needs of the university. The other will be more concerned about representing to the university the demands and interests of community groups and individuals, and pressing the university to take account of those interests even if so doing would raise land costs, increase the price of relocation, or produce financially less attractive rentals. Clearly these objectives are conflicting; just as clearly, it is necessary for the university to resolve such conflicts and decide on an appropriate balance between university needs and community expectations. At present, however, these competing perspectives are not regularly and systematically carried to any single administrator with responsibility over both offices; instead, there is *ad hoc* bargaining among the independent offices involved, with occasionally the matter being carried to the only person authorized to decide, the President. But though the President can make the necessary decisions, it is clear to us that the volume of activity and the complex nature of many of these issues are such as to make it unreasonable to expect him to devote the great amount of time necessary to keep fully informed and in a position to make timely judgments.

The clearinghouse for university-community activities would be a function of the Vice President for External Affairs intended to eliminate the considerable ignorance about the variety of community-regarding projects of the many parts of the University. No inventory of such projects now exists within the university, with the result that many schools and faculties are unaware of the activities of other units even though these activities may have important consequences for the professional and institutional interests of these schools. To remedy this defect, as well as to obtain some sense of the kinds of activities the many parts of Harvard now sponsor or staff, the Committee compiled with the aid of several student staff members a preliminary Inventory of Community Projects. This document, if kept up to date, can, we believe, serve to inform the members of the university about the activities of others, insofar as they entail an effort to deliver some service to individuals and groups in the greater Boston area. It can be given to outside individuals and organizations who wish to know what Harvard is doing in the community or who wish to propose some new activity but are unaware of existing activities of a related nature. Continuing to compile and publish this Inventory, perhaps on an annual basis, is not an onerous task, but it is one that must be the particular responsibility of some individual or office, and that person or office should be a subordinate of the Vice President for External Affairs.

We recommend that there be created an Advisory Committee on Community Affairs, to meet regularly with the Vice President for External Affairs in order to provide a sounding board for evaluating new proposals and a mechanism whereby the various parts of the university can convey their concerns to the official responsible for acting on them. This advisory Committee should be composed of administrative officers, faculty members, and students, and should be representative of all the schools and faculties of the university. We suggest that one faculty member and one student from each school or faculty be selected by such procedures as the dean of that school or faculty may devise, and that the administration members should be selected by the President. The Vice President for External Affairs would serve as chairman, would insure that the Committee be kept fully informed of the community problems facing the university and of the work of his office, and would make an annual report to the President on both the work of his office and the recommendations of the Committee.

The existing Planning Office should be given additional stature and staff, and made directly responsible to the Vice President for External Affairs. It should be encouraged and equipped to devote more effort to the physical and social problems of the university's environment, responding to the needs of neighborhood groups in areas on which the university impinges, and providing professional staff assistance to public and private agencies working in these areas. Some specific activities of an enlarged planning effort are described in Section V.

Finally, we recommend that every school or faculty in the university create within itself a counterpart of the Vice-President for External Affairs, perhaps at the rank of Associate Dean or its equivalent, whose task it would be to stay abreast of the community-serving activities of members of that school or faculty, to help devise and implement guidelines for the management of projects that intervene in the community, and to meet regularly with the Vice-President for External Affairs to exchange information and deal with common problems. In some cases, persons are now serving this function; in other cases, persons serving related functions can be assigned this additional reponsibility; in a few cases, a new post may have to be created. A parallel arrangement now exists among many schools with respect to relations with the federal government, and this informal cabinet of concerned officials has functioned to devise joint responses to problems arising in Harvard's relations with Washington agencies. The same need exists with respect to community affairs. As research and service projects proliferate, we run the risk of aggravating community tensions by competing or maladroit interventions in Boston, Cambridge, and elsewhere. Furthermore, the Committee has learned of service projects that could not be organized, or could not be easily organized, because they involved more than one school and no mechanism existed to facilitate co-ordination and joint management.

V

UNIVERSITY POLICIES TOWARD THE COMMUNITY

In the past, Harvard, insofar as it is a corporate entity, has generally followed a policy of seeking to minimize its impact on the community. There has been no effort to dominate or even strongly influence local government decision-making; few, if any, statements have been made by Harvard as to the directions in which it would like to see Cambridge or Boston develop; and little more real estate than that thought necessary for immediate educational purposes has been acquired.

There have been advantages to this strategy that should not be ignored. The university — and here we mean the Corporation — has avoided many potential controversies and has kept to a minimum (compared with urban universities) the area in which it would have the dominant voice. By avoiding heavy investments in real estate, it has restricted the instances in which its real estate practices and its behavior as a landlord could be fairly criticized.

Increasingly, however, it has become clear that many elements of the community — faculty, students, employees, and non-Harvard residents — *expect something more or* something different from the university. The university's presence, if not its actions, has created serious problems for many people, and these people in growing numbers have difficulty in distinguishing among problems caused by the university's actions, problems occasioned by its presence, and problems arising from forces unrelated to its existence. Unless a greater effort is made to clarify Harvard's intentions, those intentions will be interpreted as hostile. In addition, many community organizations and leaders are demanding that Harvard accept responsibility for some of the consequences of its presence. But most important, the students and faculty increasingly feel that having due regard for their environment is one of the responsibilities of universities generally and of Harvard in particular. Harvard has had some difficulty in responding to these demands, partly (as was suggested in the last section of this report) because it lacks the organizational capacity for making such a response and partly (as this section will argue) because it has for long believed that a policy of "minimal impact" would suffice. As a result, various misunderstandings about Harvard's intentions often go uncorrected, and Harvard's actions in any given case often strike the community observer as *ad hoc* and even improvised. Furthermore, we believe that the university misses a number of opportunities to anticipate problems and correct them.

A. Real Estate and Housing

Nowhere are these problems more evident than in the field of real estate and housing. Partly because the policy of minimal impact is rarely given a full and public statement, and partly because such a policy to some seems to imply an indifference to the community issues that exist outside the university's immediate environment, many persons have felt free to assume that the apparent policy of the university is not its real policy. As a result, the image of Harvard's development plans and the reality of those plans could not be more different. Though the image is wrong in most important details, it nonetheless affects profoundly Harvard's relations with the cities, especially Cambridge.

According to one popular version, Harvard is territorially ambitious, seeking to buy property wherever it can and doing so in accordance with a "master plan." To conceal its intentions, and out of a selfish preoccupation with keeping land costs down, the university (in this theory) buys property deviously, through "straws" or front men. It has no concern for the needs of tenants in these properties, but instead allows these buildings to deteriorate so that tenants are forced to move. Nor does it (in this theory) make any serious effort to provide housing for its own students and faculty, thus leaving them free to play havoc with the Cambridge housing market by bidding up rents. The university, according to this view, is simply a real estate speculator, buying and selling to its own financial advantage.

In reality, the situation is quite different. The university has no "master plan," or, indeed, much of any plans at all. Far from buying up property wherever it can, it deliberately keeps its real estate investments to a minimum (with assets of over one billion dollars, less than $17 million were invested in real estate or real estate mortgages, exclusive of the Harvard educational plant, as of June, 1967). The Real Estate Office does not have general authority to buy property wherever it may find it in the city; on the contrary, it requires special (and rarely given) Corporation approval to buy land east of Putnam Avenue or north of Garfield Street. The university never employs straws or front men in Cambridge real estate transactions; most land is purchased when a seller comes to the university directly and offers it a parcel. (The Committee has, however, heard that speculators sometimes purchase land in anticipation of university interest; occasionally, one may represent himself as acting "for Harvard." We can understand why such activity creates the image of Harvard endeavoring to conceal its efforts. Since Harvard must itself pay higher prices for land as a result of private real estate speculation, it has in common with the community a wish that this could be prevented, but that seems impossible.) Harvard has, of course, been increasing its real estate holdings in Cambridge, but not at a dramatic rate. Between 1959 and 1968, Harvard's total property holdings in the city increased by about one-fifth, from 6.5 million to 7.9 million square feet. (The total comprises about 180 acres, or 4.5 percent of the 4,000 acres of land area in the city.) Of the present land area, about 6.2 million square feet (about three-fourths) are tax exempt. Indeed, in the last thirty years (i.e., since 1939) Harvard's Cambridge land holdings increased by only slightly more than one-third despite the enormous growth in students, faculty, and employees. The only intermediary organization utilized by the university for real estate acquisitions is the Mid-Cambridge Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary created primarily to hold certain properties on which the University chooses not to claim tax-exemption. Finally, Harvard, unlike many urban universities, has long had a deliberate policy of housing its own undergraduates in university buildings, and it has been making serious — though thus far inadequate — efforts to provide university housing for faculty and graduate students.

In sum, the real estate and housing policy of Harvard in Cambridge can be stated as follows: First, to acquire real estate only for educational purposes and not as an investment; second, to seek to provide housing for its faculty and students with minimum injury to the community; third, to expand vertically (with high-rise construction) rather than laterally (by new property acquisitions) wherever possible; and, fourth, to remain within the area bounded by Garfield Street to the north and Putnam Avenue to the southeast. Additionally, the university has since 1928 made voluntary payments in lieu of taxes to the City of Cambridge on properties purchased and removed from the tax rolls. Of course Harvard continues to pay taxes on property not used for educational purposes.

The real question, therefore, is not whether Harvard should cease being territorially ambitious (it is not) but whether the present modest policies are adequate to present needs. One obvious question is whether the university's desire to "house its own" can be implemented without at the same time aggravating pressures on the housing market for non-Harvard residents. The purpose of building housing for Harvard members has been largely realized with respect to students in the College and in Radcliffe (only a very small percentage live — at least officially — off-campus) but it is far from being realized with respect to graduate students and faculty. Can the goals, desirable from an educational point of view, of bringing faculty and graduate students back into Cambridge * be attained without substantial displacement of present Cambridge residents? There is an even larger question: does the university bear some responsibility for the housing problems that beset the city even though those problems may be the result more of the presence than the actions of the university? Persons connected with the university, or seeking to live in its shadow, have bid up the price of housing at an astronomic rate. Partly this is the result of the action of faculty members able and willing to pay higher prices than most other Cambridge residents for existing housing; partly it is the result of the influx of affluent business and professional persons who buy or rent that which even professors can no longer afford; and

* In 1968, 1425 of the non-student Corporation Appointees lived in Cambridge (172 of this total in University Housing); 5267 or 57 per cent of the graduate students lived in Cambridge (1833 of this group in University Housing). See Table I.

TABLE I

Residence in Cambridge

Harvard Corporation Appointees and Students

	Total in University	Total Living in Cambridge	Total in University Housing *	Total in Cambridge Housing	% of Total Living in Cambridge	% of Total Living in University Housing	% of Total Living in Cambridge Housing	% of Those in Cambridge Living in Univ. Housing	% of Those in Cambridge Living in Cambridge Housing
CORPORATION APPOINTEES:									
C.A.'s who are not students	5858	1425	172	1253	24%	3%	21%	12%	88%
C.A.'s who are also students **	1050	844	277	567	80%	26%	54%	33%	67%
All Corporation Appointees	6908	2269	449	1820	33%	6%	26%	20%	80%
STUDENTS:									
Harvard College	4785	4675	4259	416	98%	89%	9%	91%	9%
Radcliffe College	1200	1180	1010	170	98%	84%	14%	86%	14%
All Undergraduates	5985	5855	5269	586	98%	88%	10%	90%	10%
Graduate Students (etc.)	9204	5267	1833	3434	57%	20%	37%	35%	65%
All students ***	15189	11122	7102	4020	73%	47%	26%	64%	36%
TOTAL: C.A.'s plus STUDENTS:	21047	12547	7274	5273	60%	35%	25%	58%	42%

* University Housing includes Dormitories, Harvard Houses, Radcliffe Houses, Shaler Lane, Holden Green, Peabody Terrace, Haskins Hall, and the Botanic Gardens.

** Includes some Teaching Fellows, some Research Assistants, some Members of the Board of Freshman Advisers, and some Administrative Posts.

*** Includes students who are also Corporation Appointees.

partly it is the consequence of students or others who (though individually able to pay very little) are prepared to join together in groups of three, four, or more to rent an apartment at prices far higher than one family can afford. Landlords, once reluctant to rent to students, have in growing numbers been prepared to raise their rents in order to drive out family tenants so as to replace them with students (from many universities, not only Harvard) who share the apartment.

The problem for some Cambridge residents is serious and persistent. In early 1968, the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc., (a separately incorporated but quasi-public agency co-ordinating many local anti-poverty programs) surveyed the housing conditions of elderly persons (those age 65 and over) living in six Cambridge neighborhoods. More than two thousand persons were contacted. About two-thirds are women, and most rent their living quarters. Of those willing to reveal their income, 63 percent stated it was under $1,500 a year. Over half (57 percent) *pay more than one-half their income for rent and heat.* Very few receive public assistance or live in public housing. Given these conditions, it is little wonder that many local citizens feel despair at, and seek explanations for, their predicament. Harvard (and M.I.T.) are the largest and most visible institutions in the city; not surprisingly, they are singled out for special blame. And yet as we have tried to argue, the policies of Harvard are not, for the most part, the major or direct cause of the problem. Cambridge is attractive to persons with high incomes or a willingness to share living quarters with others, and such persons have been arriving for decades and will continue to arrive almost regardless of what the university does.

Harvard neither caused nor can solve this and other housing problems in Cambridge and Boston. To the extent solutions exist, they require substantial increases in the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing, increases in the ability of low- and moderate-income families to pay for housing, or both. As we shall argue below, we believe that Harvard, along with other local institutions, has a responsibility to join with public authorities to devise ways of increasing the housing supply or of subsidizing the cost of housing. Community groups pressing the city government to play a more active role in housing matters should have Harvard (along with the other colleges and universities) as an active supporter. This requires going well beyond the policy of minimal impact.

In the meantime, Harvard must reassess its own real estate and housing practices to insure that they do not make matters worse. However small the direct effect of Harvard's actions (though it owns eleven hundred housing units in Cambridge, only one-fourth are occupied by non-Harvard tenants), the university, because of its visibility, its symbolic importance, and the standards of conduct to which it is held by its own students and faculty, has a special obligation to behave in exemplary ways. The Committee notes that in recent years there has apparently been an increase in the number of complaints of tenants in Harvard-owned units. These complaints include both alleged deficiencies in maintenance and alleged abuses committed in the process of evicting tenants in order to convert the building to new uses.

In an effort to determine how representative these complaints may be, the Committee decided to carry out a survey of the experiences of a random sample of Harvard tenants. The Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard kindly offered to sponsor this study. During September and October of 1968, approximately one-third of the persons living in Harvard-owned Cambridge buildings with three or more units (excluding the large structures built by the university for university occupancy, such as Peabody Terrace and Botanic Gardens) were interviewed. In addition to these 73 respondents, we endeavored to locate as many persons as possible who were living on the site of Mather House just before those dwelling units were torn down to make way for the new building. Many could not be located; of the thirty-five or so families, eleven were found and interviewed.

The vast majority (84 percent) of the present tenants indicate that they would be willing to rent again from Harvard; the vast majority (77 percent) found the building superintendent cooperative. At the same time, however, those who encountered specific problems with their unit (over 60 percent did) were not enthusiastic about how those problems were dealt with -- about half said they were dealt with "inadequately." (The most common complaints concerned repairs and plumbing.) Rent, by contrast, was not seen as a problem when Harvard properties were compared with other buildings the tenants had occupied

— 76 percent said the Harvard rent was no higher than for equivalent facilities and 43 percent said it was lower.

Certain kinds of tenants were more likely to be satisfied with Harvard properties than others. Persons who were young (under 28), students, childless, and living in large buildings were most satisfied (as indicated by their willingness to rent again from Harvard in the future); persons who were older, non-students, with children, and living in smaller (three- or four-family units) were least satisfied. Having children was an especially important factor in explaining levels of dissatisfaction, perhaps because families have more complex housing needs and higher expectations about the quality of housing than unmarried persons or couples with no children: 87 percent of those with children, but only 57 percent of those without, reported problems with their housing. Similarly, families with children were least satisfied with how their complaints were handled.

In short, if the university wishes (as we believe it does and must) to have an exemplary, and not merely adequate, record as a landlord, it is precisely about non-students and non-Harvard tenants that it must be most concerned. Dealing with problems is in the first instance, of course, the responsibility of the agent, not the owner, and indeed the majority of those tenants who had difficulties felt the agent and not Harvard was to blame. But nearly a third thought Harvard alone, or Harvard together with the agent, was at fault.

The greatest single source of complaints, however, came not from present but from former tenants: those who had lived on the Mather House site but had been required to relocate. It is very difficult to generalize on the basis of 11 interviews, though it should be noted that this amounts to about one-third of the families who once lived there and there is no reason to believe they are unrepresentative of at least the non-Harvard former residents (tracking down students who once lived there was the most difficult and they are probably underrepresented). Two-thirds of the evictees said they would be very reluctant to rent again from Harvard, not because of the services provided them (their views on service problems were similar to those of non-evictees) but because of their fear of being displaced when the building is taken for educational purposes. A majority of the evictees found the agent's attitude during the relocation process "unhelpful" and said that Harvard offered no assistance. Some said that the listings in the Harvard housing office were made available to them, but almost no one found his new unit in that way. Some tenants knew when they moved in that the buildings would soon be torn down, but most claimed that, when they signed their tenant-at-will lease the year before the relocation, they were not told candidly or clearly that they would probably have to leave before the lease expired.

Again, the data suggest but do not prove that the burdens of relocation, like the burdens of tenancy, fall most heavily on non-students. Students are more mobile, familiar with house-hunting, and adaptable to a variety of circumstances; non-students (our interviews suggest) were shaken by the relocation experience, anxious for assistance, and above all desirous of clear and timely notice.

We have no reason to believe that Harvard's record as a landlord is any worse than that of others, and some reason to believe it may be better. The owners and managers of real estate are rarely loved by their tenants, nor are they in a business that encourages the most benign and altruistic practices. The Committee is of the opinion, however, that average treatment is not good enough, especially in regard to tenants who are older or burdened with families. We are, and we are judged to be, an institution devoted to humanistic values and thus accountable to higher standards of conduct than those which prevail among most business firms. And we are an institution especially vulnerable to tenant complaints that arouse the sympathies of members of the university. We believe, therefore, that especially enlightened real estate management and relocation practices are required.

In the past, Harvard has not monitored the activities of its real estate management agent with sufficient care. Partly this has been the result of the small size of the Harvard Real Estate Office; partly the result of the inadequate staff assigned by Hunneman and Company to Harvard properties. We note that while this report was in preparation, both Harvard and Hunneman took steps to correct these deficiencies, and we anticipate as a result a decline in management problems. We believe that the Vice President for External Affairs, described in Section IV, should take special care to insure that complaints received and actions taken by the management agent are regularly reviewed.

In addition, we recommend that any future displacement of tenants be accompanied by adequate and timely relocation assistance, including ample notice when the lease is signed that relocation may be necessary, personal assistance in finding other living quarters, and the provision of the equivalent of at least one month's rent to ease the financial burden of moving.

The larger housing question, however, cannot be solved by Harvard alone. Even the problem of relocation will become increasingly difficult as the inflation in Boston and Cambridge rents continues. Nor can the university's contribution to easing of this problem, especially for older residents living on fixed incomes, be limited to constructing additional housing for Harvard faculty and graduate students. For it seems quite likely that the existence of such new facilities will not simply (if at all) take Harvard personnel out of the Boston or Cambridge housing markets and place them in university buildings, but will in addition lure back to Cambridge and Boston students and faculty now living in the suburbs. Furthermore, existing Harvard housing now occupied by graduate students (such as Peabody Terrace) cannot be opened to non-Harvard residents without substantially increasing rents (even assuming, implausibly, that displacing students in favor of others would solve either group's housing problem). Such student buildings are legally exempt from taxation, though voluntary payments to the city in lieu of taxes are now made. Admitting non-students would terminate the tax exemption, the property taxes to be paid would be larger than the present in-lieu payments, and rents accordingly would have to be raised.

Thus, the proper role of the university, in our opinion, is *both* to increase the supply of housing available for its own faculty and students and to serve as a catalytic agent which will facilitate efforts to increase the local housing supply generally (especially the supply of publicly assisted housing for persons of low and moderate incomes). To these ends, we make the following recommendations:

(1) The university should aggressively seek out appropriate sites within Cambridge on which housing for faculty and students may be built. Wherever possible (and we believe that it *is* possible), these sites should not now be devoted to residential use. We wish to increase, not simply to redistribute, the supply of housing.

(2) The university should proceed with its plans to build ap-

proximately 120 units of faculty housing on the Shady Hill site, which it now owns.

(3) We recommend that Harvard join with M.I.T. and other interested groups in urging the City of Cambridge to develop a larger program for publicly-assisted housing. In this, we repeat and add our support to the recommendation of the Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Faculty. It is vital that the supply of low-cost housing (especially for the elderly) and of moderate-cost housing (for both faculty and community residents) be increased; this cannot happen without joint public-private efforts of a kind and scale not yet attempted in the city. With the extension of the subway beyond Harvard Square, development of land now thought remote from the university (such as that near Fresh Pond and Route 2) will become practical. We believe it is possible for the city and the universities to announce, after appropriate study, a joint program to add a certain number of housing units within a five or ten year period. We would like to see the university, as part of this joint program, reconsider whether it might become the sponsor of one or more federally assisted housing programs. The university already owns property along the Charles River that might be the site of a federally subsidized development open to both faculty and non-Harvard citizens.

(4) We believe that the housing shortage in the city is now so acute as to make it unwise for the university to acquire and rehabilitate for faculty use low- and moderate-cost housing. Taking such units out of the general housing inventory is not at this time in the best interests of the community or the university.

The university administration, we note, has already taken steps to deal with these matters; indeed, before this report is issued some recommendations may have been implemented. We also are aware of one major effort by the university to respond to the housing problem that faces Cambridge — namely, the leadership and financial support it has provided to help create the Cambridge Corporation. Formed in March 1966, the Cambridge Corporation is a nonprofit, charitable organization, designed to assist in efforts to increase the housing supply (especially the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing) and to improve the economic, physical, and social life of the city. Up to one-half of the planned capital of one million dollars will be subscribed, on a matching basis, by Harvard and M.I.T. The board of directors is composed of business and professional men from the city, plus the President of Harvard and the Chairman of the M.I.T. Corporation. Among the many projects in which the Cambridge Corporation has played an important role is the Walden Square housing project that will, when completed, provide 250 to 300 units of low- or moderate-cost housing on what is now largely vacant land. The Corporation has also provided professional assistance to citizen groups in Neighborhood Four and in the Wellington-Harrington area to enable them to design community improvement projects.

For a variety of reasons, progress in all of these areas has been slow. Federal funds are now in short supply, and the competition for them is keen. The process of physical and social planning is laborious and time-consuming. Cambridge has been designated a recipient of a "Model Cities" grant, but it will be some time before the necessary plans can be developed and the promised (but not yet available) federal monies received. Vacant land sites are scarce, and all land, vacant or not, is so expensive as to make it very difficult to keep the price of new housing down.

We believe that the Cambridge Corporation can and should play a more vigorous role in the city, especially in assisting in the development of new housing. However, that Corporation is not a Harvard subsidiary, but an independent organization with its own board and staff. We do not feel, therefore, that we have either the knowledge or the authority to make recommendations to it. We do note that the community development corporation concept has worked in other cities (Philadelphia comes to mind) and we are optimistic that it can be made to work here. We also believe that there is an important contribution Harvard can make to the work of the Cambridge Corporation, and to this subject we now turn.

B. Planning

The Cambridge Corporation, to the extent it looks to Harvard for a sense of direction, or any Harvard organization, to the extent it is concerned with community problems, feels that it can find no clear statement of what the university wishes for the city of which it is a part. What sort of environment for itself does the university prefer?

Answering this question is difficult, partly for reasons already indicated. The decentralization of Harvard means that since each faculty is responsible for its own budget and endowment, it is also responsible in great measure for its own capital plant, for the size of its student and faculty population, and for its own expansion plans. As a result, forecasting what "the" university requires by way of land and housing means forecasting what various schools and faculties want, and their preferences are rarely expressed in a clear and timely fashion. Any effort by a central planning office to make these decisions for the separate schools is likely to be firmly resisted. Furthermore, even if Harvard should be able to make up its own mind, it must be aware (as, in general, it is) that it is only one voice among many in the city and therefore it cannot act unilaterally to achieve its objectives. And should it try — devising a plan and seeking to implement it — it would hardly assuage the fears of those citizens who already suspect Harvard of having a "master plan" for corporate expansion.

Nevertheless, this Committee believes that more can be done to anticipate the consequences of the university's presence and growth and to settle at least provisionally upon certain criteria or guidelines for deciding how to cope with those consequences and the problems they entail. This Committee cannot presume to make those choices for the university, partly because they require facts that in our brief existence we have not had the opportunity to gather. Even granting the difficulty in forecasting university growth, however, it would be possible to estimate the housing demand that now exists among Harvard-connected persons and may likely exist in the future under various assumptions. Such a study was done in the past and we believe it should be the function of the Planning Office to update and refine those estimates. Pending the collection of such data, and conceding the complexity and uncertainty that must surround any effort to define the kind of urban environment Harvard would like to help create, it seems to us that the alternatives are reasonably clear and that some intelligent thought about them is possible.

By its action or inaction, Harvard can aid or obstruct the emergence of one of three kinds of urban environment. In one, Harvard would be an enclave seeking to remain unaffected by, and not responsible for, the world beyond its walls. In a second, Harvard could encourage the continued "Harvardization" of Cambridge, with the city coming to be made up more and more of persons such as those already connected with the university.

In a third, the university could seek, to the extent its resources permit, to maintain a diverse and heterogeneous community even though by so doing it encourages the continuance of a degree of community conflict. Our view, and that of the university itself, is that the enclave strategy is unworkable, for there is no wall high enough to keep the university unaffected by its environment. We also find unattractive the vision of a homogenized, Harvard-like Cambridge, partly because diversity and even conflict are relevant to the intellectual life Harvard wishes to sustain. A diversified city has, to us, considerable appeal and it is also the premise underlying the plans made for Cambridge's Model City program.

If we assume the university wishes to maintain Cambridge as a stimulating and heterogeneous environment, even at some cost in both efficiency and tranquillity, then there are various approaches to that goal that suggest themselves. One would be for Harvard to act unilaterally, as the opportunity presents itself, without regard (or with little regard) for community "obstacles." Another would be to seek to play an energetic role in the affairs of the city as a whole, striving to affect the comprehensive and long-range welfare of the entire community. A third would be to give primary (but not exclusive) emphasis to managing, in co-operation with public and private organizations, the pressures it generates on its immediate surroundings.

In the past, the university has followed a variation of the first path — minimizing its involvement in local public or private enterprises. An important reason for this course may well have been the absence, during many periods, of an effective government in Cambridge that could act authoritatively on behalf of the many publics which could reasonably claim an interest in Harvard's activities. With the creation of the Cambridge Corporation, Harvard has begun to devote resources to the second path — providing an instrumentality that can assist in coping with a range of problems that affect all parts of the city. But except for occasional discussions with aroused neighborhood groups, Harvard has until recently rarely followed the third path. And yet we believe there are compelling reasons for emphasizing that path.

First, the university has more leverage (especially given its limited resources) in dealing with problems at the neighborhood level. The same amount of money and effort that would produce a small change in a large area (the city as a whole) might produce a large change in a small area (a neighborhood on which the university impinges). Second, both the university and the community are likely to be clearer about their objectives when the problems are of manageable dimensions and the results of activity will be seen soon and at close range. Third, those groups most concerned — and most prepared to act on that concern — with which the university must deal tend to be neighborhood groups. The Riverside Neighborhood Association is one such. The area it represents abuts on the university's development of the Mather House site; the housing the area contains, being close and relatively inexpensive, is that into which large numbers of students, many university-oriented persons, and some faculty are now moving. Riverside feels the university's presence keenly and is capable of articulating its concerns and methods for alleviating them. The Mission Hill area of Boston, into which the hospital complex associated with the Medical School is now expanding, is another such key neighborhood.

We recommend that the Planning Office identify these critical areas and develop the data necessary to understand the problems confronting them. We also recommend that this office provide professional and technical assistance to responsible and representative neighborhood associations interested in devising, in co-operation with the university, programs for increasing the housing supply, stabilizing the community, and improving local amenities and services. Where appropriate, the university should use its expertise to assist in obtaining governmental financial assistance and, in some cases, provide seed money to launch constructive projects, as it has recently begun to provide professional planning assistance in the Riverside neighborhood. We further recommend that when university expansion plans require the clearing of sites or the conversion of housing to other purposes, a maximum effort should be made to provide relocation assistance to the previous occupants.

We are mindful of the fact that all this smacks of "piecemeal" planning, and that many issues of concern to Harvard can only be solved by taking a city-wide view and by beginning city-wide programs. The complex and extensive problems facing Cambridge or Boston cannot be handled adequately in the context of individual projects or without reference to developments elsewhere in the city. But this difficulty is not unique to Cambridge and Boston; it is characteristic of almost all efforts everywhere to cope with urban problems. And almost everywhere the impediments to taking a more comprehensive approach are the same: community conflicts preclude any clear or agreed-to statement of objectives, urban life is so complex and so imperfectly understood that predicting the consequences of action in one place on affairs in another is exceptionally difficult, and the political capacity to implement general plans is usually lacking. Indeed, each of these problems may be especially keen in this community, precisely because Cambridge and Boston are particularly divided and public authority is under strong challenge.

In short, we are not optimistic that the university can play a major role in devising and carrying out "comprehensive" solutions to local community problems. For there to be strong action in the private sector, there must be corresponding strength, responsiveness, and commitment to action in the public sector, and this condition does not often obtain in the cities with which the university (or any local private organization) must deal. On the other hand, it is important to bear in mind the need for taking the largest possible view of local problems, and it is valuable to work toward the implementation of programs that offer more than piecemeal remedies. Thus, we believe it desirable for the university to make serious efforts to assist in the creation and operation of an appropriate public planning mechanism to which its neighborhood programs can be related. We are not particularly sanguine about the amount of progress that can be made in this direction, however, and for this reason as well as for the reasons enumerated in the preceding paragraph, we believe that our highest priority for community-regarding action should be reserved for those clearly identifiable problems that arise in those neighborhoods in which the university, in association with community groups, is competent to act.

Even with the most vigorous university action, we do not know how hopeful to be about the prospects for maintaining a heterogeneous city. It appears that without public and private action, natural forces will lead to a more homogeneous community and to the steady exodus of both those non-university residents and those faculty and graduate students unable to pay the high price of housing. The transition to this new Cambridge will be turbulent, for a change in demography implies a change in politics as well, and these changes will not be easily accepted by those finding traditional constituencies disappearing. The universities are among the few institutions that might be able to slow or alter the working of these natural forces, and to ease the turbulence and conflict they will produce. In the past they have also been among the few local organizations that have evinced any interest in the problem at all. It is encouraging that this interest exists, and we are hopeful that by vigorous efforts to increase the housing supply and respond to neighborhood problems, the universities can serve in some degree two important but partially conflicting objectives — housing their own students and faculty, so as to preserve the city as a place where scholars live as well as work, and maintaining the diversity and variety of the city as a whole.

The essential point bears repeating. The natural forces of supply and demand — primarily for housing but also for commercial space — are such that it is only necessary for Harvard to do nothing for Cambridge to become a predominantly upper-middle-class community — that is to say, a community very much like Harvard itself. In one sense, such an evolution would resolve many of the conflicts between university and community of which this Committee has spoken. Life would be simpler for Harvard. But it would not be better. And even if it were better, the process of changing from the present Cambridge to the new one would be fraught with even more conflict and turbulence than we now experience. All manner of attacks upon, and criticisms of, the university would be made by those who must bear the cost of this evolution. Narrow self-interest requires, we believe, Harvard to stand against these tendencies and to ally itself with those who wish to preserve, for as long as possible, a measure of diversity and heterogeneity. But enlightened self-interest should lead us to cherish, and not simply to tolerate, that diversity as useful to the educational purposes of the university.

C. *Personnel*

In the past, the relationship between Harvard and persons seeking employment was the opposite of that between Harvard and persons seeking admission. Until recently, as the next section will show, there were enough vacancies in the freshman class to accommodate the majority of those wishing to enter it. By contrast, until recently there were always more people looking for jobs at Harvard than there were jobs to be filled. This meant that traditionally Harvard has enjoyed the benefits of a buyer's market, and to a degree its personnel practices have been shaped by this circumstance.

With more applicants than jobs, the Personnel Office has in the past been able to devote most of its energy to screening and evaluating candidates for positions; those hired, by having met the relevant criteria, were immediately placed on the job with little or no preparation. If they proved unequal to the task, they could be let go. Turnover was moderate, in part because competition with other employers was moderate. And in the eyes of many employees there were advantages to working at Harvard — it offered a stable environment and a pleasant atmosphere, and it encouraged continuity and longevity. For many years, a pamphlet published by the Personnel Office stated that "Harvard offers more than a salary," and it was true — so true, indeed, that employees would accept wage rates slightly below the prevailing scale.

A number of oft-remarked events have changed this. A labor shortage has developed in a number of important occupations. The unemployment rate is, compared to many past years, quite low. Many specialities have come to be represented by trade unions. And perhaps most important, the inferior economic position of the black American has become a matter of national concern. As a consequence of these developments, many responsible public and private organizations are urging employers to make every effort not simply to eliminate discrimination in the labor market but to take positive steps toward hiring and promoting black workers. Needless to say, these demands are nowhere given greater attention or a higher priority than among university students and faculty. But these demands are also being made at a time when the competition for the shrinking supply of available skilled workers is the keenest and the well-trained black worker is the scarcest.

If Harvard is to respond to these new circumstances, the practices of its Personnel Office that were appropriate to an earlier era will not suffice. The Personnel Office itself is quite aware of this. But the necessary reorganization and revitalization is not yet complete, partly because the office is a personnel agency serving a university and thus one facing special difficulties. Chief among these is the fact that only about half the persons employed by Harvard are hired through the Personnel Office. Professors and other officers of instruction are, of course, selected by departments and faculties, independent of any central agency except the relevant dean and, naturally, the President and Corporation. But in addition, a large number of research assistants, secretaries, and technical personnel are recruited by individual professors or administrators who do not ask Personnel for candidates. Here again, decentralization is an impediment to central action.

But this does not settle the matter. The vast majority of nonprofessional employees (and there are about six thousand of them) are hired from candidates supplied by the Personnel Office, even though the final decision is, of course, in the hands of the department, faculty, or office concerned. (The Personnel Office does not hire employees so much as try to obtain an inventory of potential employees; about the only ones it hires are its own workers, totalling some fifty in number.) Furthermore, the tighter labor market has meant that turnover has increased — the Personnel Office estimates that about one-third of the nonprofessional employees have to be replaced each year — and thus there are every year a fairly large number of vacancies for which workers are wanted.

Owing in part to the initiative of the Personnel Office, some gains have been made in hiring black workers. Slowly various parts of the university, or various unions operating in those parts, that once rejected blacks have been brought to accept them. The total number of black employees has more than doubled since 1963, increasing from 157 then to 357 thus far. Most of these employees (nearly two-thirds) are to be found in the medical area, in Buildings and Grounds, and in the Food Services Department. Indeed, it is somewhat ironic that in an institution divided between an academic and a business-service component, the greatest concern over black employment should be expressed by the former and the greatest progress in hiring blacks should have been made by the latter. Buildings and Grounds, with about a thousand employees, has 52 blacks; the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, with more than four thousand employees, has 48. Indeed one large Arts and Sciences Department in which professional and personal concern about race is quite keen has no black employees at all.

Despite the gains made by the Personnel Office, gains especially impressive considering how decentralized is the hiring function, this Committee, along with many university offices, feels much more can be done. Less than 3 percent of the thirteen thousand employees of the university are black. Until a group of Law School students drew attention to the matter, little was done to require that contractors doing business with the university show positive signs of compliance with the equal opportunity provisions of the law. Though contacts have been made by the Personnel Office with agencies serving prospective Negro employees, these contacts have on the whole been intermittent and somewhat passive, and have resulted in only a few mutually rewarding relationships. This is the result, we are convinced, not of ill-will or indifference but of inexperience in this new and difficult area.

The Committee commissioned a modest amount of research on the view black-serving employment organizations had of Harvard as a source of jobs. Representatives of the New Urban League, Action for Boston Community Development, the Opportunities Industrialization Center, Jobs Clearinghouse, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Roxbury Multi-Service Center, and the Neighborhood Employment Center were interviewed, as were members of the Harvard Personnel Office. Three kinds of complaints were made. First, employment agencies felt that Harvard, unlike some employers, insisted that a candidate have all the requisite skills at the time he applies. There is no pre-employment training program (with exceptions noted below) and therefore no way to recruit black applicants in a labor market already so competitive that the experienced black employee (for example, a highly qualified Negro secretary) has a number of offers from which to choose. Harvard was frequently compared unfavorably with private industry in its slowness to accept marginal candidates and to invest in improving their skills.

Second, the best qualified blacks can often find better-paying jobs in private industry. Harvard should not expect to compete on an equal basis for these persons. The reality of the job market is such that Harvard, to get the employees it needs, may have to shift the basis of its appeal somewhat from immediate money inducements to the opportunity for pre-job training that will increase the skills of applicants. Furthermore, since applicants often appear when jobs are not available and fail to appear when they are, there is something to be said for using job training programs as a way of bringing prospective employees into the university when they can be found and then assigning them to departments when they are needed.

Third, almost all employment agencies reported that they and their clients experienced great difficulty in coming to grips with Harvard as an employer. Only a few realized how decentralized is the university, and thus its employment procedures. At the simplest level, many prospective employees have difficulty in finding, physically, the Personnel Office; if they have found it, many are referred by the Office to the various hiring departments with little preparation to do the job in question and often with the almost certain likelihood of rejection. (We might add that we have some sympathy for members of the Personnel Office who are mildly irritated at those university departments that, after years of rejecting black applicants for jobs, are now pressing the Personnel Office for "instant" black employees.) Beyond the decentralization problem, however, lies a deeper problem — the employment agencies believe the university is essentially passive about black recruitment. Repeatedly, our interviewer was told of inadequate communication from Harvard; of receiving out-of-date job lists; of infrequent visits from Harvard representatives; and of a lack of a close working relationship between community agencies and university recruiters.

We are well aware of the great difficulties that confront any organization seeking to cope with this problem. Under the spur of a suddenly generated and impatient concern over social equality, demands that particular institutions solve general problems that have been neglected for decades will inevitably lead to some frustration and a good deal of confusion. People who once thought that by extending liberty we would eliminate inequality have learned rather recently that raising income is somewhat harder than passing a civil rights bill. But it is equally clear to us that Harvard at the very least must do as much — however little in absolute terms that may be — as is expected of other large employers, public and private. We believe it can do at least this; hopefully it can do more.

The first requirement is for Harvard, at the highest level, to adopt a comprehensive, affirmative, and specific personnel policy directed especially at the question of recruiting, hiring, training, and promoting disadvantaged workers. Here, as elsewhere, action has been in response to pressure but rarely in accord with any policy. Such policy as exists has emerged much like the common law — case by case, and as part of an oral history. We recommend that the President and Fellows request the Personnel Office to draft such a policy for the consideration of the Corporation and that, when adopted, it be given the widest circulation.

Second, as part of such a policy the Personnel Office should inaugurate a vigorous and continuing program of recruitment in the poorer neighborhoods of the central city, and especially in those neighborhoods (black and Spanish-American) where barriers of discrimination overlaid by the habits of defeatism make economic advancement particularly difficult. Local employment agencies in these areas should be regularly visited and kept well-informed as to job opportunities at Harvard.

Third, the Personnel Office should be encouraged to go forward with a program it now has under consideration for a pre-job and apprentice training program. Where possible, we believe it desirable to assist and work closely with community agencies, such as the Opportunities Industrialization Center and others, that already are prepared to provide such training. But as a supplement to this, and in some cases as a substitute for it, Harvard should have its own program. One such program has already been developed. Teen-age Employment Skills Training, Inc. (TEST), in collaboration with the Personnel Office, carried out in the summer of 1968 a program to provide on-the-job training to high-school-age young men in Cambridge. The facilities of the university, particularly in Buildings and Grounds, were used, and apparently with good effect.

Fourth, the university should continue to explore, as it has during the past few months, the possibility of joining with other universities and other large employers in the Boston area to draft a joint agreement that would insure that contractors and trade unions serving those institutions have an affirmative policy toward the hiring of blacks.

We note with satisfaction evidence of what can be done with strong leadership and clear objectives. One of the most integrated elements of the university is the Harvard University Police, which has seven blacks on a force of some sixty men; of the seven, one is a sergeant and one a lieutenant. Where persons with the necessary skills can be found, or where people interested in learning can with a modest investment be equipped with those skills, we would hope that other parts of the university might look to the police as a model of what can be accomplished by active cooperation between a department and the Personnel Office.

D. Admissions

The University not only hires people from, and occupies space in, the local community, but also admits into its student body, and especially into Harvard College, young people from Boston, Cambridge and other nearby cities and towns. But unlike its policies on real estate or personnel, which are or should be suited to local conditions, its admissions policies cannot be governed simply or even primarily by the needs of the community; they must be based in the first instance on a judgment of what kind of College and graduate school population Harvard wishes to have and how best that population can be assembled from persons applying from all parts of the country (and, indeed, the world). It is with respect to College admissions that questions of local area representation are usually raised, and thus it is to College admissions that this section is devoted.*

For the first three centuries or more of its existence, Harvard College had, in effect, no admissions policy. The composition of the student body was determined, in the phrase of W. J. Bender, former Dean of Admissions, by "natural forces." Chief among these was the fact that almost any reasonable applicant who could afford a Harvard education was welcome to seek it. Desire and money resources were the major criteria governing admissions. By the middle of the twentieth century, however, what Dean Bender called the "selective era" began, owing to an increase in the number of applicants to a figure substantially greater than that which could be accommodated. As late as 1952, 62.8 per cent of all applicants were admitted; by 1968 the proportion had declined to 18.5 percent. Some principle of selection had to be settled upon. The easiest course would have been to choose academic excellence, defined by test scores, as the single criterion, and leave the matter at that. Without formulating very precisely an alternative criterion, this "top one percent" policy was rejected. As Dean Bender put it, the College decided to "show a little more humility and humanity and catholicity in our search for talent." He urged that it become, and in substantial measure it has become, a place with "a certain range and mixture and diversity in its student body — a college with some snobs and some Scandinavian farm boys who skate beautifully and some bright Bronx pre-meds, with some students who care passionately if unwisely (but who knows?) about editing the *Crimson* or beating Yale, or who have an ambition to run a business and make a million, or to get elected to public office . . ." In short, the student body was not only to be excellent, but in some degree representative.

---

* In speaking of the College, it may be worth noting that no member of the Committee on the University and the City attended it and only one member even applied (he was accepted, but turned it down in favor of Yale). This fact will no doubt explain to some whatever shortcomings this Report may have.

But representative of what? The high school and independent school population of America can be divided into an infinite number of classes and categories; which are to be selected as groupings that "ought" to be represented in the College? The answer, it appears, is that the Admissions Committee has sought variety in the students' backgrounds, talents, interests, and goals without attempting to devise any rigid formula that would hinder the Committee's ability to judge student strengths on almost an individual basis.

Nevertheless, two representational criteria can be discerned: region and socio-economic background. In the College, an effort has been made to insure that Harvard would be a national university by recruiting and encouraging applicants from areas outside New England. About 30 percent of the College students are, in a typical year, from New England, another 30 percent are from the Mid-Atlantic states, about a tenth from the South, about a sixth from what the Admissions Committee is pleased to call the "Old Northwest Territory," and another sixth from the Pacific, Mountain, and Central states. There has been a similar effort to find and attract students who might never have considered college at all or, if they had, would have considered Harvard an "unlikely" college for them to attend. Financial aid has been increased (between 1960 and 1967, the number of freshmen entering with Harvard scholarships increased from 316 to 463); the search for students whose promise exceeds their scores has been intensified; the proportion admitted from public rather than independent schools has steadily increased (the former now comprise about 60 percent of the total); the number of black students has grown substantially (and now totals about 175 in the College).

It is the judgment of the Committee on the University and the City, as it has been the operating assumption of the Admissions Committee itself, that a special relationship exists, and should exist, between Harvard and its immediate environment and that this relationship should be reflected in its student population. That relationship has grown weaker in recent years, despite the Admissions Committee's efforts to encourage and view sympathetically applications from local students. The Special Committee on College Admissions Policy, chaired by Franklin L. Ford, reported in February, 1960, that "we are well on our way to losing touch with our own community. Each year fewer Harvard graduates are being fed back into the businesses, the professions and the politics of the state in general and the Boston area in particular. Whereas Massachusetts residents constituted 55.1 percent of the Harvard Class of 1929, they come to only 21.3 percent in that of 1963. This is a development which no university, public or private, can afford to view with equanimity." The Ford Committee urged that a "continuing effort" be made to "attract qualified applicants from Boston and its suburbs" without in any way sacrificing standards.

The Admissions Committee has acted on this recommendation. In recent years, admissions officers have tried to visit every local school — public, parochial, and private — to speak with interested students and their counsellors. Financial aid has been available since 1952 in an amount sufficient to insure that any local student requiring assistance could have it. In that year, the President and Fellows established for *all* graduates of Cambridge schools scholarships that supplemented the Buckley Fund which, since 1905, has provided aid to graduates of Cambridge public schools. In the selection process, preference for qualified local students has, if anything, increased.

Despite these efforts, and during a period when the proportion of freshmen from Massachusetts has remained fairly constant (at about one-fifth), the proportion from Boston and Cambridge has continued to decline. Seemingly, the causes are to be found in forces we are powerless to alter. The center of population has moved outward from the core cities to the suburban fringes, and correspondingly the center of the student population has shifted from core-city schools to suburban schools. Owing to their more favorable financial and other circumstances, these suburban schools have made great strides in preparing young people for college, while core-city schools have had to struggle simply to keep up. One source of local Harvard entrants, the children of Harvard faculty, makes up a decreasing part of the local public school population — as the Committee on Retention and Recruitment of Faculty reported, 80 percent of the faculty children of high school age living in Cambridge attend private schools.

Whatever the causes, this Committee believes that efforts to resist current trends should be continued and perhaps enlarged. A number of proposals have been made to us for increasing the College's ability to attract and hold disadvantaged students, especially from the local community. One has been to launch a summer training program that would open Summer School courses to disadvantaged students, under appropriate tutorial supervision, in a way that would familiarize them with the nature and problems of undergraduate study and prepare them for admission to a university. Another would be to create a special tutoring program for freshmen who had been admitted as "risks" by current admissions standards. A third would be to expand and reorient some of the offerings of the Commission on Extension Courses to make evening programs a vehicle for pre-college preparation, perhaps conducting the courses in community classrooms. All of these programs, and others that could be mentioned, have a certain appeal, but they also carry certain risks. It is not clear, for example, that singling out "high risk" admittees for special attention would not stigmatize them or set them apart from the regular college experience, nor is it clear that the College itself is especially competent to provide, in effect, secondary education. Some of the professional schools have had substantial experience with special programs of these and other types and can provide useful assistance to College officials in appraising both the opportunities and pitfalls of such programs. Because of these considerations, and because only one member of the Committee is from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, this Committee does not feel itself competent to make specific recommendations in this area.

Rather, we feel that this question requires the same kind of attention and organizational effort we find needed in the field of housing and real estate. The Summer School, The Extension program, the College, and the Admissions Office have parallel and, in some measure, overlapping interests with respect to student recruitment and preparation. We recommend, therefore, that central direction be given to the effort to consider alternative strategies for insuring that the representation of local community students, especially those now lacking encouragement to pursue college studies, will not continue to decline. Though we are loath to proliferate committees, perhaps one could be formed on the recruitment and training of Boston area students, made up of officers from the College, the Admissions Office, the Summer School, the Extension program, and the Graduate School of Education. Its purpose would be to consider and coordinate the several experiments now being urged on the university.

Harvard can do more, however, than simply to keep open its doors to local students. Many students would prefer, or be better suited for, a different kind of college experience. For example, identifying black students who are college material is a larger and more important question than simply identifying black students who might be Harvard material. The sharp increase in black students attending Harvard is gratifying, but equally gratifying is Harvard's participation in a multi-university program established to help young people in impoverished areas of Boston gain admission to, and financial aid for, college study. The Center for Opportunity for Progress in Education (COPE) was organized in 1966, with a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, by a group of admissions officers from Boston-area colleges and universities and counsellors from Boston high schools. The Harvard Director of Financial Aid has served as chairman of the Executive Committee, while Northeastern University administered the funds. During 1967–1968, COPE, through its three branch offices in the North Dorchester-Roxbury area, saw 1,260 students, of whom over half were black; 700 eventually applied for higher education, and 564 were admitted to some college or university (419 of these in the greater Boston area). By counselling and tutorial programs and placement services, students are motivated toward and guided in seeking a college education. Unfortunately, COPE has not had the funds to offer financial assistance except insofar as it can persuade students' colleges to extend it out of their own resources.

Finally, we can report that the suspicions of some regarding the ethnic biases of College admissions policy are unfounded. The tales of the warfare between "Yankee" Harvard and Catholic Boston are all too well-known to need repeating here; suffice it to say that, whatever truth there may once have been to these tales, they have long ceased to apply. Though no one keeps any records on these matters, the best-informed estimates we can find suggest that something close to one-fifth of the College student body is Catholic. There is no doubting the determination of the Admissions Committee to insure that whatever religious or ethnic conflicts once may have divided us no longer do so.

E. *Extension and Summer School Programs*

Since 1910, the Commission on Extension Courses has offered college-level adult education courses to persons living in the Boston area and, since 1956, it has offered, in co-operation with WGBH-TV, instruction by television. The Commission is not, strictly speaking, a subsidiary of Harvard but rather a collaborative venture in which Harvard joins with Boston College, Boston University, M.I.T., Simmons, Tufts, Wellesley, the Boston School Committee and the State Department of Education. However, though course instructors are drawn from all the institutions belonging to the Commission, in fact Harvard has for many years been the administrator of the program. Other members of the Commission now have adult education programs of their own, with the result that the Extension program has become largely a Harvard enterprise. Financial support for these courses comes in part from the Lowell Institute, whose benefactor, John Lowell, Jr., stipulated in his will that a fee equivalent to the value of two bushels of wheat might be charged for "more erudite and particular courses."

During 1967–1968, 96 courses were offered in the Extension program, for which there were 7,635 registrations in Cambridge and Boston (another 992 persons, members of the U.S. Navy, took courses for credit via television). At the end of the year, 48 persons were awarded the degree of A.B. in Extension Studies.

The Extension program is clearly one of the most important community-serving activities undertaken by Harvard. Almost all the courses, however, are offered in or near the Harvard Yard, and relatively few are addressed to current "urban" issues. We would urge the Director of University Extension to review the structure, offerings, and location of his program to see what opportunities may exist for broadening the scope of the courses and improving the access of more distant parts of the community to those courses. Large segments of the Boston-Cambridge community may be unaware of Extension offerings, or may feel slightly intimidated by the prospect of entering the Yard to enroll.

The Harvard Summer School, unlike the Extension program, enrolls a student body drawn from the nation as a whole. However, in two senses the Summer School is a community-serving endeavor — about one-fourth of the students come from the Boston metropolitan area and the School sponsors a wide range of cultural events during the summer months that are readily available to anyone in the community. As with the Extension program, however, the Summer School has had difficulty in devising courses (or attracting faculty) concerned with "urban" issues. Perhaps its greatest success in dealing with one aspect of "urban" issues (and especially revealing of the fact that the "urban" problem has distinctly non-urban roots) is its participation, with Yale and Columbia, in a summer program that brings to the three universities every year some 250 students and faculty from about 70 Southern colleges, mainly Negro. There has been a greater effort to find and prepare Southern blacks than to find and prepare comparably disadvantaged persons from the Boston area. This may be less the fault of the Summer School than the greater difficulty of finding and financing competent faculty to staff a "local" program rather than a "black" program.

Mindful of these difficulties, the Committee is nonetheless of the view that a greater effort should be made to make the Extension and Summer School programs more responsive to the needs and interests of the local population. To that end, we offer the following recommendations:

(1) The Commission on Extension Courses, as a multi-university consortium interested in adult education, might be reactivated to provide joint planning and joint offering of courses for various elements of the Boston area population. At a minimum, a systematic exchange of information among these institutions would seem desirable; at the optimum, some division of effort, done in collaboration with community organizations, might be undertaken.

(2) Extension course offerings could be provided in other parts of the city besides Harvard Square. This year, a proposal from a Roxbury organization, jointly sponsored by the Urban League and Boston College, was received by the Extension pro-

gram, requesting that Harvard credit and financial assistance be given for a course, to be offered in Roxbury, on urban research methods. After discussion, this proposal was approved for credit. Similar undertakings might be planned for succeeding years, by actively seeking out such opportunities well in advance. In improving accessibility, no sacrifice in educational quality should be tolerated. But we believe that standards can be maintained even when courses are held in other parts of the city and on subjects not conventionally part of the Extension program, provided, of course, that the necessary funds can be found. We wish we could assure the Commission that such funds are readily available; unfortunately, we can only urge them to seek out support for programs of this kind.

(3) Continued efforts should be made by the Summer School and Extension to seek out qualified instructors who will offer Extension and Summer courses that discuss important policy questions from the perspective of an academic discipline. Courses in urban politics and government, urban economics, race relations, urban history, the law as it pertains to the various relations between the city and the citizen, and other subjects are now badly underrepresented.

VI

UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND THE COMMUNITY

WITHIN THE SIZABLE capital plant of the university are a number of facilities that have been, or might be, used by community residents for educational and recreational purposes. The university museums are regularly enjoyed by large numbers of visitors. Chartered buses bringing tourists and school children to these facilities are a common sight, and there are few faculty members or students who have not on some occasion been asked where one might find the glass flowers. Of late, a number of requests have been made by persons in and outside the university that other facilities — the libraries and athletic fields, for example — be made available for general public use. Indeed, some spokesmen have urged in the strongest terms that the university's reluctance to admit community residents to Widener Library or to the Harvard Stadium can at best be explained by aloofness and at worst by selfishness.

One might suppose that with the buildings and stadium already in existence, it would cost little or nothing to let persons not carrying a Bursar's Card enjoy them. But it is neither disinterest nor self-interest that leads the university to be cautious about providing such apparently "free" services. The reason is simple: the services are not free at all, but quite costly to a university facing some critical space shortage.

Widener Library is the clearest case. Keeping an adequate supply of books available for hundreds of professors and thousands of students is already taxing the financial resources and space limitations of that institution. The crowded circulation desk and reading room are visible evidence of the mounting usage. No one who has discovered that the book he seeks has been checked out or the periodical he desires has been misplaced is easily persuaded — at the moment, anyway — that what

Widener needs is more users. Because of these pressures, the Librarian has found it necessary to deny borrowing privileges to students attending nearby universities and to casual visitors. In general, only members of the Fletcher School and M.I.T. students who have cross-registered in Harvard courses are allowed to use the library; the others must rely on their own facilities. And for students attending colleges which have no cross-registration arrangement, there is almost no chance of using the Harvard library except through inter-library loans. Alumni and outside scholars who are willing to pay a fee are granted library privileges, but even the fees collected, though they no doubt seem large to those who pay them, are inadequate to cover the full cost of the privilege.

If Widener or the other Harvard libraries are to allow wider use, then it would seem appropriate to begin, not with the general reading public, but with other college students and faculty members whose studies, research, and even livelihood require the use of a good library. At the present time discussions with M.I.T. are underway to discover what mutually beneficial opportunities for sharing various facilities (including library space) might exist. Even if — indeed, especially if — M.I.T. and Harvard should make greater use of each other's facilities, there is little reason to hope that these resources can become open to unrestricted use by the public.

The museums illustrate the problems that develop if institutions designed for academic use become general attractions. In some of these buildings, there has been a steady and even spectacular growth in the number of visitors. (It is one measure of how poorly equipped they are to serve visitors that in many cases no one even knows how many such persons enter.) The congestion at the Fogg Art Museum and the Busch-Reisinger Museum seems manageable, perhaps because their art exhibits have a more specialized appeal. But the Ware collection of glass flowers in the University Museum, the animals in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, the rocks in the Museum of Geology and Mineralogy, and the Indians and arrowheads in the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology are apparently irresistible.

In general, these facilities are neither organized nor staffed to handle large crowds. There are no guides and almost no guards; three janitors at the Peabody try to combine keeping order with carrying out their maintenance functions. There has been, regrettably, an increase in the incidence of vandalism and in the number of complaints from parents and teachers who feel that museums do not provide adequate assistance in serving the educational objectives of tours taken by school children. Parking space in the areas around the main museum complex is almost nonexistent and the traffic patterns are forbidding; neither seems likely to improve and the latter, we might add, seems to change almost weekly. The buildings themselves are in some cases improperly designed for use by large crowds.

And perhaps more important than present difficulties are the larger issues that speak to the purpose and future of these institutions. What should be the proper balance between Harvard research and study on the one hand and community visitations on the other? Might we not consider meeting the space needs of students and faculty by reducing the public display areas? On the other hand, if public display is to be a major objective, then should we not address the question directly and boldly of how best to serve the community and visitors to it? These museums and their treasures are, for thousands of Boston area residents, the only face of Harvard they ever see. Should we not be under some special obligation to make it as attractive and educational as possible?

In short, the use of university facilities is not a simple question of "good community relations," cheaply achieved, or "free" sightseeing. It is rather a question of whether world-famous facilities, established in the 19th century and housing materials of incalculable value, should be used in a catch-as-catch-can manner by Harvard and non-Harvard persons sorting themselves out as best they might, or whether the university should adopt and work toward a policy that by plan combines in an optimal way the teaching and research function with the community service function.

We think that closing the museums to the public, as has on occasion been suggested, would be a mistake. Already the space devoted to public display has been reduced in some facilities. The museums can contribute to the educational opportunities of all persons in the Boston area in a way that cannot be duplicated by any alternative facility. And many of the materials stored in these buildings are unique or so important that Harvard has an obligation to put them on display.

This Committee recommends that the directors of the museums, in association with the Planning Office and the Dean's Office, be asked to submit joint proposals for dealing fully and over the long term with the public display and educational functions of their facilities. We hope that deliberations leading to these proposals will include a wide range of alternatives not limited to simply modernizing and staffing present structures, though we recognize that this may be all that is possible. Included in these considerations should be the possibility of finding a wholly new site for the public display facilities, one that is easily accessible and with ample parking, and the possibility of developing mobile displays that can be taken into the community (to schools especially). We realize that these proposals might seem more attractive if the Committee could locate the new funds that will be necessary to carry them out. We can only say that in an era of preoccupation with urban problems and of concern for what universities can do for the community, it is easy to overlook such facilities as our museums; they seem to some irrelevant to the issues of the moment. But we would remind ourselves that the university now affects the experience of more persons through the access provided to these facilities than it does in any other single way. They are not resources to be treated lightly.

Finally, a word about athletic facilities seems in order. Already the playing fields and the swimming pool are used by a number of community groups. Young residents of the Roosevelt Towers public housing project, through the intercession of students from Phillips Brooks House, have used during the summer the Indoor Athletic Building, the Carey Cage, and Soldiers Field. So also have students enrolled in the Upward Bound program, the Teenage Employment Skills Training group (TEST), and the Challenge program for Cambridge High School students run by PBH. Not every group can be accommodated, however, and Harvard cannot supply wholly out of its own resources the recreational needs of a large community. The Committee finds that deserving groups have been served in the past and will continue to be served in the future.

No statement on this subject will appear complete without some reference to the desire on the part of many to see the Harvard Stadium used to help alleviate the needs of various professional sports organizations in Boston that lack adequate facilities of their own. To some, it would appear that Harvard's response to the "urban crisis" is to be measured in large degree by its willingness or unwillingness to lend the stadium to teams unable to build a stadium of their own. The proposal is not new. Without entering too deeply into the matter, it is worth suggesting that had the Harvard Stadium been used for professional sports several years ago, a permanent Boston stadium would be no closer today; indeed, progress, if anything, might have been even slower. To those who wish such a professional sports stadium, we suggest that they regard a denial of access to the Harvard facility as one way of trying to hasten progress toward a permanent solution.

VII

UNIVERSITY FINANCES AND THE COMMUNITY

THE CURRENT market value of Harvard's assets is, as almost everyone is aware, something in excess of one billion dollars. This sum is both a blessing and a burden. It is, of course, comforting to know that the income from investments of that magnitude is available for educational purposes, and that because of these privately controlled resources, Harvard can more readily avoid excessive dependence on government funds and thus excessive entanglement in government restrictions. But at the same time, the idea that Harvard should be "worth a billion dollars" conjures up images of the President and Fellows having at their unfettered disposal a vast sum of cash that, each year, they can spend as their fancy takes them, on a variety of programs and with every assurance that such boundless affluence will leave no worthy cause short of funds. To some it appears that Harvard does not face a shortage of money but only a shortage of imagination on how to spend that money; this being the case, all that is necessary is to alter the priorities now set by the Corporation, and all needs, both of the university and the community, can be met. Some persons have even proposed that Harvard give away some substantial part of its endowment to support certain community endeavors; in this view, what morality requires, Harvard can afford.

Though the Committee on the University and the City is composed of professors, and though professors have a natural inclination to assume that the Treasurer and President can (and should) pay for anything professors want, this Committee must state that such an approach to university finances is naive and unrealistic. In the first place, Harvard, like all universities, public and private, is facing severe financial pressures that will undoubtedly grow worse. Earnings from endowment — the income on the famous billion dollars of capital — pay for less than one-quarter of the university's expenses, and that fraction has been declining since the 1920's. To cover the difference, Harvard has increasingly relied on government grants and contracts, but no one wishes to see that reliance reach the point of dependence. In an effort to keep up with expenses, tuition and other charges to students have steadily increased, and will no doubt increase in the future, but there are limits to what students can be asked to pay. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the largest single unit in the university's budget, has already begun to encounter deficits.

Second, the capital available to Harvard, though largely invested in a common account, is in fact not the property of "the university" but to a great extent the property of the various schools, faculties, institutes, laboratories, museums, houses, centers, and forests that make up "the" university. About 38 percent belongs to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 13 percent to the Medical School, and so on. Less than 13 percent is assigned to "the" university — that is, to the President, for various university-wide purposes. Nowhere is the decentralization of Harvard better illustrated than in the area of finances. "Every tub on its own bottom" means that each of the 54 separate budgetary units within the university must balance its own books. Each must raise its own endowment, extract tuition and other fees from its own students, and keep its expenses in line with its income. If it is prudently managed, it can keep its own surplus; if it is not, it must find a way to meet its own deficit. The funds of one school cannot be taken to meet the problems of another. To be sure, "Harvard" — *that is, the Corporation — does provide assistance* from time to time to the various parts of the university. Certain common facilities and services are paid for out of the University Account. Certain new structures — the Cambridge Street Underpass, for example — are built with "university" funds. Occasionally, and with obvious reluctance, the Corporation will lend (and, even more rarely, give) capital to a school or faculty in need of assistance, but (as any dean will testify) this is quite the exception and not the rule. As is explained in the informative booklet *The University and Its Resources*, "each Dean . . . has not only independence of academic program but must accept financial responsibility for it, and find the money to keep it operating . . . 'Harvard' simply does not possess the resources to support indefinitely any component that cannot itself demonstrate its importance to the world of scholarship."

Third, much of the endowment and income is restricted as to use. A large part of the funds given to Harvard are given not only for educational purposes and no other, but in many cases are given for some specific educational purpose and no other. The Treasurer is now analyzing the Harvard capital structure to discover exactly what part is restricted in this way. His report will be completed shortly. But one fact is already clear — the unrestricted income available in the University Account (i.e., the "free money" at the disposal of the President and Fellows) is only 4.6 percent of the annual expenses of the university as a whole. These restrictions, imposed by donors and reinforced by law, mean that the Treasurer is under a moral and perhaps legal obligation to conserve and enhance the funds given to the University, and that the President, deans, and others are under a moral and perhaps legal obligation to spend these funds for educational purposes.

In practice, of course, there is often no clear distinction between an "educational purpose" and some other purpose. Indeed, the President and Treasurer have in the past recognized that some problems of the community touch Harvard in ways that affect its educational functions. Housing students and faculty is one such. There are educational advantages to having an environment that permits or encourages a large number of students and faculty to live in or near the university, so that the interaction which promotes learning does not occur simply between 9 A.M. and 5 P.M., five days a week. Harvard is (or should be) not simply a university, but an intellectual community. It cannot be such a community unless it takes into account the way Harvard affects its urban environment and is in turn affected by it. For this reason, funds from the University Account were used to provide a subsidy to the married students' housing project, Peabody Terrace; for the faculty housing project, Botanic Gardens; and, as noted, to construct the Cambridge Street Underpass. Nor has the housing of its members been the only way in which Harvard funds have been spent in the community. It has also subscribed a substantial part ($250,000) of the working capital of the Cambridge Corporation, a nonprofit organization supported by Harvard, M.I.T., and various Cambridge business firms and created to assist in the economic, physical and social improvement of the city.

We believe that there are additional opportunities for investments in the community that are within the legitimate educational interests of the university. We have already called attention to the concern, expressed by growing numbers of Cambridge and Boston residents and officials, that the growth in the number of faculty, students, and university-oriented persons living near the university has created heavy pressures on the price of housing and profoundly altered the character of many neighborhoods. Until now, Harvard has followed a policy in these matters quite different from that of many universities. Several big-city educational institutions have invested heavily in real estate near the university and have also allowed (or been unable to prevent) the steady movement of faculty residences away from the university precincts. Harvard, by contrast, has avoided large-scale real estate purchases, believing them to be unwise investments (and also productive of community conflict). At the same time, Harvard has been successful in keeping its faculty within reasonably close range of Harvard Yard * and has, through the house system, provided on-campus living for almost all of its undergraduate students.

It is not clear to us that this policy and this state of affairs can continue as in the past. Unless Harvard is willing to see community residents increasingly angry at the pressures created by the university's presence and its necessary expansion in educational facilities, and unless Harvard is willing to see students and faculty increasingly joining in community protests intended to give expression to this anger, it will have to reconsider the extent to which its local investments ought to be increased and directed toward projects that serve both neighborhood and university interests. Specifically, we believe that it is in the educational interests of the university to seek out, actively, ways of increasing the supply of moderate-income housing in those areas of Cambridge and Boston on which the university impinges. The university already owns some commercial sites that could be redeveloped to provide housing for students and faculty and perhaps for community residents as well. Federal programs exist to bring

* Though less than half the Arts and Sciences faculty lives in Cambridge, the majority of the non-Cantabrigians live in the nearby towns of Arlington, Belmont, and Lexington.

down the cost of that housing, and the university should display a greater willingness to take advantage of these governmental aids.

At the same time, we recognize that there are limits on how far the university should go in this direction. It does not have the unrestricted funds to solve the housing problems of two large cities. And it is not clear that it would be wise, even if it were legal, for the university to spend its funds on the scores of community-improvement projects that have from time to time been commended to its attention. The university, it is sometimes said, should support "community projects" by helping finance consumer co-operatives, Negro businesses, local cultural programs, neighborhood organizations, school innovations, and the like. Many of these projects are worthy of support; some might even fall within the educational purposes of the university; a few might be carried out without Harvard being forced to choose among competing community claimants for Harvard funds. But we believe that, in general, it is a mistake to expect the Harvard Corporation (or the Treasurer) to act as a surrogate community chest; it lacks the resources, the legal power, and the administrative mechanism to play any such role. For several generations, the university has struggled to free itself of the pressures of legislatures and business firms seeking to impose their standards and restrictions on Harvard. The effort to make the university free of political and corporate demands was arduous and sometimes the issue was in doubt. Now that this freedom has been assured, it seems to be a step backward to "politicize" the university by demanding that it act in the community as a corporate agent of social change and as an institution with the power to choose among leaders, organizations, programs, and objectives. Indeed, those most desirous of seeing the university politicized might be least pleased with the political goals it *would* seek should it undertake that kind of involvement.

Nevertheless, the university disposes of vast sums of money (it spends about $170 million a year) and it contains many students, employees, and faculty members with an urgent desire to see more resources devoted to the solution of community problems. Funds are now collected within the university for community purposes through the annual United Fund drive. And parts of the university — Phillips Brooks House is a leading example — do carry out community-serving projects and in addition receive a university subsidy (in the case of PBH, from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, in the amount of $20,000, and limited to reimbursement for certain "fixed costs" of the House and not to be used for "program costs").

We recommend, therefore, that the university consider creating a new opportunity for the members of the university to contribute funds to community programs, especially for new and high-risk programs that now have difficulty obtaining funds elsewhere, and to support existing community-serving projects now undertaken by Harvard students and faculty. We propose that the Harvard Community Foundation be created, separately incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the laws of Massachusetts. The board of the Harvard Community Foundation would be composed of faculty, students, employees, and administrators from all parts of the university. It would have an executive director. It would be authorized to raise funds from among the students, faculty, and employees of the university through a fund drive and through soliciting pledges, the payment of which could be automatically deducted by the Comptroller's Office from the paycheck of faculty and other employees. An opportunity would be offered to alumni who are regularly solicited for gifts for current use by, for example, the Harvard College Fund, to allocate some fraction of their gift to the Harvard Community Foundation. We would hope that the university Treasurer might wish to allocate some fraction of the university's unrestricted endowment and/or income to the Foundation in order to provide it with a continuing base of support.

The Harvard Community Foundation would welcome applications for loans and grants from all sources, but it would give heavy emphasis to persons inside and outside the university who seek support for programs intended to benefit the Greater Boston area, and especially the area near the university. Existing university organizations, such as Phillips Brooks House, could turn to the Foundation for help in supporting some of their programs.

We would emphasize that the Harvard Community Foundation should supplement, not supplant, Harvard's contribution to the United Fund. We see these two organizations as serving very different needs. The Foundation would be primarily concerned about social programs in areas on which the university impinges, and programs that, because they are new, untried, risky, or controversial would not find support from established charitable or government sources.

We note that other institutions are developing similar "internal" foundations. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology began a "Community Service Fund," in May 1968 with an initial target of $20,000. Various schools at Harvard sought funds from their own faculty and students for various special purposes. We see as a principal advantage of such a Foundation that it places the responsibility for deciding what projects to finance squarely on the shoulders of those whose interests and money are enlisted. Election to the board of the Foundation ought to be on the nomination of the existing board and by the vote of those who have contributed.

The Treasurer of Harvard cannot and should not choose from among various community projects those on which he might wish (if he were authorized) to spend money given to Harvard for educational purposes. But the persons who ultimately receive that money — students, faculty, administrators, and employees — can and should make such contributions. The university should create a mechanism that would facilitate such giving. This Foundation should not be created, however, unless it is clear that student and faculty interest in it is strong. We hope that the discussion of this proposal among members of the university will serve as a measure of its probable success.

APPENDIX

INVENTORY OF COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Introduction

The following compilation of Harvard's community-related projects supplements the Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City. It was prepared from descriptions furnished to the Committee by the faculties of the university. It deals with activities which the faculties sponsor, and which faculty members and students now are, or recently have been, carrying out. This "inventory" should be assessed only in relation to the substantive discussion and findings contained above in the main body of the Report.

In discussing the role of Harvard, or any university, in the urban community, nothing is clarified by drawing invidious distinctions between "action" and "research" efforts. Projects sponsored by the Harvard faculties in the community are undertaken not only because the community benefits directly, but also and just as importantly because the purpose of the university — to fulfill its mission to society by advancing knowledge — also benefits.

On the one hand, faculty members and students often give direct consulting assistance in areas of their special expertise, when people or agencies need immediate help. The Business School, for example, runs a special course for small businessmen from the inner-city.

On the other hand, faculty members often undertake research studies in which members of the community are, purely and simply, asked to serve as "subjects." The School of Education for example, sponsors a project that studies young children and how home and pre-school surroundings influence their intellectual development and educability. Sooner or later, it is hoped, the results of many such projects will help to improve the quality and conditions of urban life.

In between these extremes, there are many degrees of participation by, service to, and feedback for members of the community in Harvard projects. The great bulk of Harvard's work displays a mixture of service, research, and teaching objectives, in keeping with the objectives of the university. When the Medical School, for example, collaborates with the Teaching Hospitals to run medical care programs for thousands of Boston residents, the results are measured not only in terms of improved family health, but also in terms of training for doctors and nurses and findings on how family health care can best be delivered to the community. Such programs, moreover, are prototypes, as are so many other Harvard efforts.

In what follows, projects are listed under the sponsoring School or Department. This should not obscure the fact that the range of Harvard research work often involves specialists from many disciplines with particular problem areas. Staff members of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of Harvard and M.I.T., for example, aided the City of Cambridge in preparing its successful application for participation in the "Model Cities" program of the Federal Government. Now the School of Design, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, plans research on the administrative structure of the Model Cities programs in several Massachusetts communities — the way in which all the agencies and organizations participating are brought together and structured.

The listing of projects, extensive as it is, by no means gives a complete picture of Harvard's efforts in urban affairs. For one thing, the listing does not reflect at all the contributions of Harvard faculty members and students acting as individuals in community life. It was possible to compile detailed information only on those projects considered to be under the formal sponsorship of a faculty or department. Moreover, this listing focuses almost entirely on efforts carried out in the Boston metropolitan area. Harvard faculty members carry out study and advisory work in many other cities, and with state and Federal governments. It should also be noted that the activities of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences are not summarized specifically in this inventory. Several special programs, such as the contributions of undergraduates through Phillips Brooks House, and the Museums, University Extension, and the Summer School, are described in detail in the text of the Report.

Finally, this compilation does not attempt to list the costs of each of the projects included (or to evaluate the benefits of services provided or knowledge gained). It is estimated, however, that the total cost of the projects described here is in excess of $12 million. Funds come from a variety of sources, including those of Harvard faculties and departments. The University is grateful for the assistance, in the form of grants and contracts, of federal, state, and local agencies, and for the grants and generous gifts of many private organizations, foundations, and individuals.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Community Development

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS. What techniques can be applied to "renewing" — in physical structure and morale of residents — the ghettoes of the nation's cities? A research group in the Program on Technology and Society, mainly composed of Business School faculty and staff, proposes as one step a new set of community-oriented institutions: a system of development corporations. Established in a state or city, an Urban Development Corporation would channel funds and provide technical advice to a chain of Local Development Corporations, set up and run by community members. The Harvard research group is helping the Boston Model Neighborhood Board to organize and finance such a local corporation in Roxbury-Dorchester. The group is also advising the state of New Jersey and organizations in the city of Newark, where community development corporations are now being started.

URBAN LEADERSHIP. Business School faculty members have assisted the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to enable business leaders to bring their resources to bear in practical ways on urban problems. The Chamber has sponsored Urban Leadership Workshops in several cities, and plans to offer them for local sponsorship in many more, including Boston. Faculty members from Harvard and other universities teach the seminars, which enroll groups of 25 business and other community leaders of broad influence.

TEACHING MATERIALS. The School has launched a program on Business Leadership and Urban Problems. It aims to produce, by mid-1969, a sizeable body of case studies, readings, films and other materials dealing with business involvement in urban activities. The program will also develop an information system on what businesses across the country are doing in community development. When completed, the materials will be made readily available for instructional use in Boston and other cities.

MANAGEMENT METHODS. Business School Faculty members and doctoral students participating in an Urban Analysis Project are assisting the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs in the application of management-science methods to the Department's planning problems. As their first task, they are helping to prepare a proposed housing policy for the Commonwealth, including a five-year plan for housing low- and moderate-income families.

Business Assistance

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR. This project is designed for blacks who are, or expect to become, businessmen. Classes are held weekly in Roxbury or at the Business School, in cooperation with the Joint Center for Inner City Change, a community organization. About fifteen students are now enrolled.

CONSULTING SERVICES. Nearly one hundred Business School students carry on a Business Assistance Program, established in 1966 and controlled by the students themselves. They consult for black proprietors of small businesses, aiding the businessmen with advice on bookkeeping, merchandising, credit policy, financial planning, and other subjects. About fifty clients are now being served. The program is affiliated with the Jobs Clearing House and the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Boston.

NEW ORGANIZATIONS. A seminar of the School explores the patterns of new organizations emerging in response to crises in the nation's cities. Students receive course credit from assisting businessmen and community development organizations in Boston and elsewhere, and for analyzing and reporting their observations. Findings of the seminar will, in time, be presented to community leaders.

Minority Groups

SPECIAL COMMITTEE. The School this year created a Committee on Disadvantaged Minorities, comprising nine senior Faculty members. It will try to focus and forward the School's efforts to help minorities, especially blacks. Thus its concerns are broad: curriculum, research projects, relations with the black business community, interests of black students at the School. The committee also monitors the Small Business Development Seminar, described above.

RACIAL INTEGRATION. For the past two years, the School has sponsored a seminar on the management of racial integration in businesses. Thirty-five business leaders, black and white, attended each seminar session: they came from throughout the eastern United States, including Boston. The seminar will be repeated this year in Cleveland and Detroit.

EDUCATION STUDY. The Harvard Business School Association, collaborating with Northeastern University and the Stop and Shop Foundation, has commissioned a study of what the leading U.S. business schools are offering in management education for blacks and other minorities. The study will also seek to identify special business education needs of blacks, and to design a basic curriculum. Results of the study will be distributed through the Urban Affairs Committee of the Association. Thus, guidance will be provided to companies in Boston and the nation on how they can more effectively support local management-education programs for disadvantaged minorities.

THE SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

Community Dental Services

ELIOT CENTER. The School of Dental Medicine provides comprehensive dental care to children and expectant mothers in the Martha May Eliot

Family Health Center in Jamaica Plain near the Roxbury line. The six-chair clinic is staffed by two dental hygienists, an X-ray technician, and the equivalent of three full-time dentists. Since early 1968 the School has also carried out a health education program in seven Jamaica Plain public and parochial schools near the Center. Dental hygienists talk to the children, and work with their teachers on follow-up lesson materials. This fall the Harvard team began a case-finding service in the seven schools, examining all the children and recommending dental treatment when necessary. Close cooperation is maintained with the pediatricians, public health nurses, and social workers at the Center. First- and fourth-year dental students rotate through for orientation and clinical service. The Eliot center has thus become the site for a regional pilot program integrating dental public health with dental care.

SURVEYS AND TREATMENT. The School is frequently called upon to perform surveys of dental conditions in local areas in connection with projected public health programs or epidemiologic studies of disease. One such survey was performed in Holyoke last year. Another survey was taken among the children in the Winchester public schools. Similarly, a dentist hygienist was sent this year to six nursing homes affiliated with the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston to clean and check the teeth of patients. Fourth-year Harvard dental students now visit these homes to provide the patients with treatment at cost.

HEAD START. Since 1966 some 4,000 Boston children have been examined and treated in a dental program within Project Head Start, organized and run by a member of the School of Dental Medicine at the request of the Boston City Department of Health and Hospitals. The children receive health education, have their teeth cleaned, and receive topical fluoride applications. Those who need further treatment are referred to private practitioners. The project recruited neighborhood aides to serve as Spanish and Chinese interpreters and to make sure the children kept their appointments with the dentist.

FLUORIDATION. The School's Department of Ecological Dentistry has maintained a constant effort to promote water fluoridation as the most effective, safe, and practical preventive measure for tooth decay. Since 1958 these efforts have centered on repeal of a state law singling out fluoridation as the only public health measure requiring public referendum before enactment. Working with the Massachusetts Citizen's Committee for Dental Health and the Council on Dental Health of the Massachusetts Dental Society, the Department has helped guide a rising tide of public and professional opinion which culminated in July, 1968, with the passage of a law returning authority to fluoridate to local boards of health. This law went into effect October 7, 1968, and has survived its first legal challenge. Communities all over Massachusetts are responding to the new opportunity. Several communities have already ordered fluoridation and many (including Boston) are mounting educational campaigns and engineering feasibility studies. Massachusetts should soon leave its unenvied status as the state that ranks 48th in use of fluoridation.

The School of Dental Medicine's collaboration with the Medical School in a new Commission on Relations with the Black Community is described in the Medical School section below.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF DESIGN

Technical Help to Neighborhoods

URBAN SERVICES. In 1968, the Graduate School of Design set up an Urban Field Service. It has two objectives: (i) to provide free technical help to groups unable to afford regular professional assistance in city neighborhood planning and improvement, urban design, and landscape architecture; and (ii) to give Harvard students the experience of working in an urban community. In its first term the UFS took on five projects, each involving about five Design students and a supervisor:

—For *Hawthorne House* in Boston, the Service drew up an overall space plan, which included the conversion of a chapel into a gymnasium for local teenagers. When a financial crisis developed, the Design School team turned to producing brochures and helping along a fund-raising campaign. With the drive completed, the gymnasium is now under construction.

—Another Field Service team worked with a coalition of five community groups in Boston's *South End* who felt that urban renewal plans for the area should take more account of the needs of low-income people. After gathering information from residents, realtors, developers, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Design students published two reports which called for, among other things, more "leased-housing" and changes in proposed housing rehabilitation plans.

—Another group of Design students was invited to help a neighborhood group create a plan for the development of *Highland Park* as a part of the Boston Model Cities Program. The students worked with a representative group from the community in setting up committees to focus on four problems: housing, police, education, and social service and health.

—A fourth UFS team was invited to help residents in Boston's *Bromley Heath* secure federal money recently set aside to help cities modernize existing housing projects. The students used proposals by residents in producing a report submitted to the Boston Redevelopment Authority. In addition they set up a summer program for children in the project, beginning with a youth-designed and directed recreational program.

—For the *East Somerville Citizens for Action*, Design students helped plan a new school to remain open nights and during vacations for use by the whole community. A committee which the students helped the ESCA create has already selected three architects and reported on them to the Mayor. Last summer these students also started a tutorial and recreation program in East Somerville.

The Urban Field Service took on nine projects in the fall of 1968, with 43 students involved (of whom 33 are from the School of Design).

The Urban Crisis

TASK FORCE. A "task force on the urban crisis," consisting of a faculty member and a student from each GSD department, was formed in the spring of 1968. It is investigating means by which the School and the design professions can become more responsive to the needs of the chronically disadvantaged urban poor. Funds have been allocated for scholarships, and other funds made available to provide travelling expenses for faculty who volunteer services to community and other organizations.

NEW TOWNS. A GSD urban design team and regional science group have prepared a prototype design for a high-population-density "new community." It is a prototype, intended for further study as a means of achieving a new environment for low- and moderate-income people. The "new city" is itself regarded as a vehicle for social and economic betterment of residents attracted to it from less satisfying neighborhoods in the core city. The theoretical site chosen for the new town plan lies near Mansfield, southwest of Boston. This massive research project, completed in June, has resulted in a two-volume technical report; its findings served as the basis for the School's annual Urban Design Conference in 1968 (whose proceedings have now been published). The project team received the cooperation of faculty from many Harvard professional schools, together with consultants from industry, government, professions, and the community.

Study Projects

MODEL CITIES. In collaboration with the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, the Department of City and Regional Planning will begin a research project this spring on the administrative structure of the Model Cities programs in several Massachusetts communities—the way in which all the agencies and organizations participating can be brought together to work most efficiently.

HOUSING. Recently the Department of Architecture completed a project aimed at improving the design of low-income housing. The architects worked with white and black persons from most of the Boston housing projects, translating the information they collected into physical sketch designs and setting up standards by which changing goals and needs of housing can be dealt with.

COMMUNITY DESIGN. The School's Center for Environmental Design Studies has undertaken a major research project in "community design," in cooperation with the School of Education. The project explores the potential for change and revitalization in the older parts of metropolitan areas. It is believed possible that improving certain community facilities or services could encourage neighborhood improvement planning.

HIGHWAY AESTHETICS. This project is studying ways in which aesthetic criteria can be defined for, and included in, highway design. Specialists in highway planning, engineering, the behavioral sciences, and the arts — many from the Boston area — are acting as consultants.

REGION INDUSTRY. Through a Boston Region Interindustry Study, faculty members are developing a framework for regional impact studies and regional development. The study concentrates in part on environmental problems. For example, methods are being devised to measure the impact of industrial growth on water pollution. Methods are also being devised to compare the economic structure of Boston with that of other cities.

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

Interns in the Community

SUPERVISED FIELD EDUCATION. This program places Divinity School students in clinical and social settings where they can be of service to the community. They work in parishes, homes, mental institutions, hospitals; they run coffee houses for college undergraduates, tutor disadvantaged youth, engage in planning for neighborhood social action, and help the Boston Human Relations Task Force, among many other activities. Students function as members of teams, assigned this year to some 31 projects; all told, 98 candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity participate. They spend at least one full year on a project, and are required to take two years of the field education program to obtain their degrees. Scholarships permit students to take advantage of this program. Thus the projects can be chosen for their educational merits independent from available remuneration. Field Education is viewed as a key element in the B.D. curriculum at Harvard, demonstrated by the involvement of all members of the faculty in it as advisors and resource persons. The B.D. curriculum provides seminars in connection with the various field projects, for which academic credit is given.

Theology shapes, and is shaped by, its context. The Field Education Program thus serves as a testing ground for the entire theological enterprise, besides benefiting, in a variety of ways, members of the Greater Boston community. It is one of many examples of "internship" programs of the university. See the descriptions below for projects of the Schools of Education, Government and Law.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Urban Collaboration

PLANNING AND CONSULTING. To plan and coordinate strategies of attack on urban educational problems, the School last year set up a new Office of Metropolitan Educational Collaboration. Its staff works with individuals and groups in Boston concerned with problems of racial and class segregation in the public schools. OMEC members, for example, helped Operation Exodus and the Boston School Department organize the King-Timilty Advisory Council. They also helped to develop the proposal through which financing for the new Educational Collaborative for Greater Boston was obtained. (EdCo plans joint activities between urban and suburban school systems in the Greater Boston area.)

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER. In 1964, the School of Education established a Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences to develop systems of applied research and to promote collaboration between the university and the communities of Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Concord, Lexington, and Newton. The Center helped support field-service directors in several of these communities, who worked with school departments, community groups, and educational reform agencies. Now in its last year, the Center is conducting informal negotiations toward expanding the idea of "schooling" to embrace more than purely academic work, and to draw on the talents of professionals in other fields, such as medicine, social work, and business. The Center gave rise to several projects that will continue, among them OMEC and EdCo (described above), the Harvard-Boston Summer Program (described below), and the Teacher-Liaison Institute. In this last, teachers from the Greater Boston area have come to Harvard in each of the past three summers for a workshop on educational innovation. The teachers then chose projects to accomplish in their schools during the following year. A group of "alumni" of the project have recently formed a nonprofit organization, Metropolitan Educational Associates, Inc., to carry on some of the Institute's functions.

Services to Children

READING. Since 1966, Cambridge youngsters with reading problems have received free remedial help at Harvard, from a service which also provides clinical experience for School of Education students taking a course on reading disabilities. About 25 Cambridge children come to the School of Education twice a week, and each child is treated for as long as he seems to benefit, an average of one year.

TESTING. Another Graduate School of Education course, on psychological testing, also provides a free service to any group that wants it: administering and interpreting intelligence tests. Among the clients have been the Youth Service Board, the New England Aid Center, and a number of tutoring programs in Roxbury.

Special Education Programs

HARVARD-BOSTON. The Harvard-Boston Summer Program, run by the Graduate School of Education in cooperation with the Boston Public Schools, is an experimental summer school that was set up four years ago to give children from poor neighborhoods an academic boost, and to help teachers respond more sensitively to special problems of such children. This past summer, 250 children participated in the program, held at the McCormack School in Dorchester: 50 Boston teachers worked with the Harvard professors and suburban teachers in planning and teaching the curriculum.

HARVARD-NEWTON. During the summer, all 130 enrollees in the two-year Harvard Master-of-Arts-in-Teaching curriculum participate in the Harvard-Newton Summer Program. This non-credit session for 500 Greater Boston students in grades 1–9 is sponsored by Harvard and the school systems of Arlington, Boston, Belmont, Brookline, Concord, Lexington, Natick, Needham, Newton, Waltham, Wayland, Wellesley, Weston, and Winchester. Teachers are recruited from throughout the country, with a large number coming from the Greater Boston area. The program is designed as a training ground for the Harvard degree candidates and an enriching educational experience for the children.

UPWARD BOUND. The Graduate School of Education contributes both faculty and funds to the Cambridge Upward Bound project, designed to increase the vocational and academic options open to high school students from low-income families. Each year the project, which is also staffed by Harvard students associated with Phillips Brooks House and by Boston-area teachers, tutors and counsels 50 to 75 high school sophomores and juniors during the academic year, and in an intensive eight-week summer program.

Research in the Community

PATHWAYS. The research project "Pathways to Identity," sponsored by the School of Education, investigates lower-class urban Negro subcultures, and how they affect the personality development of the urban child. Sixty-one Negro boys participate; they are paid an hourly rate for extensive interviews. Also interviewed are the boys' families, peers, and teachers, as well as Negro adults who came from poor backgrounds but achieved success in later life.

BUSING. Another School of Education study, directed by a faculty member of the School of Public Health, dealt with Operation Exodus; it was designed to reveal the effect of busing on participants, both parents and children. Exodus is a private organization which since 1965 has bused Negro children from overcrowded ghetto schools to city schools with empty seats. As part of the research project, Operation Exodus received about $20,000 in federal funds to help finance the busing. The researchers compared the children who are bused with children who remained in Roxbury, in respect to social adjustment, school achievement, educational aspirations, and attitudes toward learning and control of their environment. Findings have recently been announced.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT. How a child learns, and how his experience and environment affect his intellectual development, are being analyzed by another Graduate School of Education research group. Its members are tracing the development of children from birth to six years of age. They are carrying out observations in seven pre-schools in Eastern Massachusetts, and about sixty homes. Findings of relevance to urban youngsters are expected, particularly in respect to the effects of home and other surroundings on the children's educability.

Testing New Materials

ACHIEVEMENT. In the schools of Cambridge, Arlington, and Quincy, School of Education researchers have introduced experimental programs in achievement motivation. Preliminary data indicate that after receiving training, students get higher grades, encounter less disciplinary trouble, and have an increased sense of power to control their own lives.

CAREERS. Such practical testing of innovative educational methods often benefits school children of this area. In 1969, for example, the School of Education will begin testing a new "information system for vocational decisions" in the Newton public schools. It is a computer-based system, intended to help people make better-informed decisions about future jobs, education, training, and retraining.

PHYSICS. In 1969, Harvard's "Project Physics" will make general release of a novel and exciting high-school physics course (which also has a college-level edition). The material was tested in a number of schools in the Boston area, and elsewhere. Texts, laboratory equipment, films, programmed instructions, and readings are among the products. Curriculum development is finished and the staff is concentrating on education and teacher training.

INTERNS. Individuals, organizations, and community agencies in the Greater Boston area are aided by School of Education students in a variety of field practicums. Internships range in scope from short-term assignments to full-time positions as school teachers and guidance specialists in Boston and its suburbs. The School of Education's internship programs are among the largest of the University. All candidates for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching, for example, take on one year of paid, supervised work in a school or other internship setting. About one hundred teaching interns are in the field this year, 12 in the city of Boston.

"CLIENT" STUDIES AND OTHER CONTACTS. School systems and other educational agencies are also aided by studies carried out by School of Education degree candidates, under professional supervision. In a School of Education course on "education and public policy," for example, student groups develop specific policy proposals for local government agencies. In the Administrative Career Program, doctoral candidates and faculty carry out a study of a nearby school system each year. Last year the system was Watertown's; this year, it is Lowell's. A variety of other School of Education courses prescribe some amount of community contact, during which students often participate in the work of community agencies. One such course is "Community Educational Planning," whose members this fall are considering physical, social, political, and economic aspects of that problem in Charlestown. In another, master's candidates work as staff for agencies and educational reform groups throughout the Greater Boston area.

THE KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT AND THE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

Experimental Programs

In its first years of new program development, the School has established, under the auspices of its Institute of Politics, a number of experimental programs that may be expected increasingly to bear upon problems in the local community.

PLANNING. Each year a broad range of non-credit seminars deal with specific political issues and governmental problems existing at the city, state, and national levels. Many focus on urban problems generally; others focus specifically on problems of concern to Harvard's immediate community. In response to students' interests, some of these groups are shifting from abstract discussion to concrete "workshops," designed to develop practical solutions to problems, to formulate policies, and to propose these to responsible public officials. It is hoped that the workshop concept will be extended into many areas of mutual interest and concern to faculty members, students, and community leaders.

PRE-CAREER INTERNSHIPS. To provide graduate and undergraduate students with job experience that may help lead them to career commitments in the public service, the Institute is presently establishing an intern program. Last summer, three undergraduates were placed in positions of some responsibility in public agencies in the City of Boston. In the summer of 1969, approximately 24 will be placed in selected positions throughout the nation — the majority of them in public and private community agencies in Boston and Cambridge. The program is expected to continue to expand in numbers, and for advanced graduate students about to enter the public service, to become a year-long rather than a summer venture. The Institute is also giving awards for students writing honor theses, to free at least a part of their time to pursue research of political interest. Last summer, one recipient worked on the Boston Model Cities project, and another in an area mental institution. About a dozen such awards will be given in the summer of 1969.

POLITICAL AIDES. In this election year of 1968, the Institute has cooperated with the Republican and Democratic State Committees to place more than 60 students from the university as campaign aides to local candidates for election to city office, the General Court, and the Congress. On the one hand, they became acquainted with problems and techniques of campaign organization; on the other, they became involved in constructive political activity in the community.

Technical Assistance

INFORMAL EFFORTS. At first as an unexpected by-product of its Fellows Program, and now as a newly organized effort of the Student Program, the Institute is providing increasing amounts of technical assistance to local and state governmental agencies and community action groups. On an informal basis, qualified people have been made available for technical advice and assistance, for task groups and planning, and even for administrative direction of programs in the local community. These informal efforts will continue and probably expand in scope.

STUDENT SERVICES. In addition, the Institute has recently launched a more organized effort to make available the services of students to the local community, on a professional basis and on the community's own terms. The directors of more than 150 local government and community agencies have been advised that if they are in need of organizational or technical services that might be supplied by students, graduate or undergraduate, the Institute will try to match their needs with the talents of interested students in the university community. These first efforts have elicited opportunities for students to serve with groups at the local and state levels on problems involving the politics, sociology, economics, and law of poverty, welfare, public health, housing, education, conservation and land use, and other pressing problems in more than a dozen communities in the local area. The initial response to this modest Institute initiative suggests that there exists a sizable opportunity for bringing the talents, competencies, and energies of students to bear upon problems of local government — problems that go untended when there is not effective communication between responsible public officials and people at the university eager to help.

THE LAW SCHOOL

Legal Services

NEIGHBORHOOD LAW. The Community Legal Assistance Office, set up by the Harvard Law School in 1966, offers free legal services to Cambridge residents who cannot afford to hire lawyers when they need them. Under the guidance of four full-time staff professionals, 120 Harvard Law students man the neighborhood office, interview clients, investigate problems, and prepare both civil and criminal cases for trial. The students also represent community action groups, handle test-case litigation, and lead community education programs about the law.

LEGAL AID. Free legal assistance is given also by the Legal Aid Bureau, comprising 45 Law students assisted by a professor and a practicing attorney. In Roxbury, for instance, the Bureau helps tenants in disputes against landlords, and businessmen in the Harvard Business School's small-business assistance project. Some of the Law students also maintain office hours at state mental hospitals to advise patients on their legal rights.

DEFENDERS. Another 40 Law students, the Harvard Voluntary Defenders, give free legal aid to poor people accused of crime. Under the supervision of the Massachusetts Defenders Committee, Inc., the students interview defendants, prepare cases, conduct trials in district courts, and help prepare cases to be tried in the Superior Court. The students also represent committed prisoners who petition for release from Bridgewater State Hospital, and do legal research for prisoners in any state who seek post-conviction remedies.

Legal Research

CIVIL RIGHTS. About half the work of the Law School's forty-man Civil Liberties Research Committee is done at the request of local lawyers or groups. The Committee's research covers human rights, racial problems, and poverty law. It publishes a *Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* covering these fields. A subsidiary committee has been formed to conduct legal research on the draft law and the selective service system. Local lawyers and groups use this Committee as a source of information — the Committee does not itself undertake litigation.

LEGISLATION. Another Law School group, the Student Legislative Research Bureau, drafts legislation on urban issues and problems; though its work is nationwide, it from time to time accepts local projects as well. The Bureau solicits requests for its services, sending out 400 letters a year and accepting about ten assignments. Proposed legislation is reviewed by both students and faculty before being forwarded to the client. The Bureau publishes the *Harvard Journal on Legislation.*

Field Work

URBAN PROBLEMS. The Law School faculty conducts a "workshop" in urban problems. Students are placed as interns with urban-related agencies in the metropolitan area; they work on legal research and drafting assignments. Some 22 students are in the program this year. In a new departure this year, moreover, eight students are receiving academic credit for a year-long independent-research project concerning territorial organization for the provision of various services in Boston. Members of the City of Boston's new Office of Public Service help facilitate the work, and sit in a special seminar which the faculty conducts in connection with the project.

STUDENT D.A.'S. In another Law School program, third-year law students get clinical experience in the preparation and trial of criminal cases in the Commonwealth. After training, they appear in court as Student District Attorneys, trying nonjury and six-man-jury cases. They work under the supervision of the District Attorneys of Middlesex and Suffolk Counties. The project also aids local law enforcement agencies with legal research.

THE MEDICAL SCHOOL

Medical Care

THE TEACHING HOSPITALS. Medical education is in large measure "learning by doing" in the clinics and other facilities of hospitals. Thus the Medical School, through its association with many major hospitals in the metropolitan area, helps to provide care for a large proportion of the urban community. Harvard's associated Teaching Hospitals are Beth Israel, Boston Hospital for Women, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Children's Hospital Medical Center, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Massachusetts General (including McLean), Peter Bent Brigham, Robert Breck Brigham (all voluntary or private hospitals), and Boston City, Cambridge Hospital, Massachusetts Mental Health Center, and the West Roxbury V.A. Hospital (all government-run). In addition to offering inpatient care, most of the hospitals have outpatient services and emergency units. A number have special programs of neighborhood service, as described below.

A BROAD NEW PLAN. Recently the Medical School decided to establish a plan to provide comprehensive pre-paid health services to subscribers. This new program will furnish, at reasonable cost, medical and hospital care to 30,000 Greater Boston residents. They will receive a broad range of medical services, from ambulatory, hospital, and home care to health education and family counseling. The Harvard Community Health Plan will work with existing insurance plans, and will contract with hospitals and other health institutions for services. Clinics will be staffed with specialists in a variety of medical fields. The new plan, which gives coverage considerably broader than existing plans, is meant to serve as a prototype for health insurance programs of the future. Its participants will represent a cross-section of the community, including at least 20 percent specifically from low-income families.

OTHER HOSPITAL PROGRAMS. The Medical School collaborates with Teaching Hospitals in several special programs of community service.

— For the past 13 years, the Children's Hospital Medical Center and Medical School have conducted a *Family Health Care Program* that provides medical care to 3,500 Bostonians who live near the School. The program aims to find and test the best ways of delivering family health care to a community, and to train medical students, nurses, and social workers in family medicine. A nursery school operates on the grounds, and nurses from the Program visit homes and conduct health education meetings in the community.

— Harvard doctors also serve in health programs run by other Boston hospitals in communities with a high percentage of poor families. One such is the *Roxbury Clinic* of the Beth Israel Hospital. This comprises a Maternal and Child Care Program which provides complete prenatal care, delivery, postnatal care, and family advice; and a Child and Youth Care Program, for children through the age of 21. Neighborhood health aides have been trained in the Clinic, and its staff works closely with The Ecumenical Center and other Roxbury groups.

— The *Martha May Eliot Family Health Center*, which supplies maternal and child care to 1,200 families in Roxbury and Jamaica Plain, is staffed by pediatricians and obstetricians from the Medical School. The School of Dental Medicine and Public Health also provide staff specialists. Mothers and children through the age of 21 receive primary care at the Center and supportive care and hospitalization at Boston Hospital for Women and the Children's Hospital Medical Center. The

Health Center tries to involve members of the community other than simply as patients. It has set up a Neighborhood Advisory Committee and trained community people as neighborhood aides, and it works closely with the Jamaica Plain Area Planning Action Council. Programs are similar to those of the Roxbury Clinic of Beth Israel, described above, which serves an adjacent geographical area.

— In the *Bunker Hill Project*, the Medical School is working with the sponsoring hospital, Massachusetts General, to bring comprehensive medical and social care to residents of Charlestown. Planning began more than a year ago. The first step is coordination between the Hospital and a large number of community agencies.

— Plans are now being developed to convert the *New England Hospital* into a unique institution — a kind of campus — for health-related training programs and care facilities. The New England Hospital for Women and Children, founded in 1863, is located in the heart of Roxbury; with only 110 beds, it is too small to be serviceable as a modern hospital. In the new plan, programs may include health clinics, facilities for extended care for children, for care of handicapped children, and for day care of children, as well as programs for training health aides and for recruiting persons into nursing and technical careers in the health field. The Beth Israel Hospital Roxbury Clinic has recently moved to New England Hospital's grounds. On January 1, 1969, two programs concerned with recruiting and training are to take up residence. These are ODWIN (Open the Doors Wider in Nursing) and "Careers."

CAMBRIDGE HOSPITAL. In 1965 the Cambridge Hospital joined with the Medical School in programs of teaching and research in clinical medicine and improved patient care. With a large addition recently completed, Cambridge's city hospital is on its way to becoming a community medical center, with a large staff of practicing Cambridge physicians. Working with these local doctors, City and Hospital officials, and other Cambridge health and family services, Harvard is helping to set up a modern system of medical care and health services for the city. The Medical School has already cooperated in establishing new services for Cambridge residents within the city hospital: an Acute Psychiatric Service, a Child Development Center, and a Self-Care unit for patients about to be released.

The Black Community

TRAINING. With the growth of private and government-sponsored health insurance plans, the health industry is expanding and needs manpower, especially people trained in the "paramedical" skills. Cooperating with the Children's Hospital, the Medical School plans an institute to train 500 to 800 persons each year for jobs as nurses aides, laboratory technicians, medical secretaries, and other techniques on which the health care field depends. Training will also be offered to supervisors and instructors in these fields. By locating in Roxbury, the new school hopes to recruit heavily from the black community.

JOB-FINDING. On a smaller scale, a job-finding effort in Roxbury made headway last summer and will be continued. A Medical School Committee found summer work for some 30 black high school and college students and high school graduates by canvassing the Faculty about available jobs. The positions, mostly as medical secretaries and technicians, were filled with the help of organizations within the black communities of Roxbury and North Dorchester.

A NEW COMMISSION. As a step toward broadening its service to blacks, the Medical School (with the School of Dental Medicine) has now established a Commission on Relations with the Black Community. Composed of students, faculty and staff, the Commission has assigned task groups to study and report on particular problems, among them education and employment of medical aides, recruitment of disadvantaged students, medical care needs and facilities in the black community, and training and hospital relationships for physicians practicing in the black community.

Community Psychiatry

CONSULTANTS. Research and consulting by members of the Medical School's Laboratory of Community Psychiatry often directly benefit individuals and organizations in the Boston area. Under the Laboratory's Community Service Unit, for example, 17 psychiatrists, nurses, and other professionals each give two days a week to work in the community. They advise, and discuss cases with, ministers and teachers, and in settlement houses, youth service agencies, health departments, local anti-poverty units — places people turn to when they are in trouble.

RESEARCH. This is only one facet of the Laboratory's work. Researchers with the Program for Advanced Study of Metropolitan Problems and Mental Health examine the general mental health problems of urban populations, trying to come up with better strategies for community health research and practice in the future. The nature of mental hospitals is changing, and Laboratory staff members are investigating what happens when such institutions as Boston State Hospital turn themselves into community mental health centers. The physical environment influences the minds and movements of men, and another Laboratory group is trying to determine what architectural and design features mental health facilities should have. Other studies are directed to problems of individuals. Retirement is a case in point: here 500 Boston men and women are being interviewed, their morale assessed and their responses to retirement evaluated. In another program, community members provide each other with help: five Dorchester women, themselves widows, work as widows' aides, trying to reach all newly bereaved women in the area by letter and telephone with the aim of providing them with counsel and the opportunity for social occasions and discussion of common problems. This is another of the ways in which the Laboratory fulfills its broad aim of helping an urban population that faces a high risk of mental illness.

The Medical School's collaboration with the School of Public Health in a new Community Health Center is discussed in the School of Public Health section below.

THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Bringing Health Services to the Community

NEW CENTER. The growth of medical knowledge has far outpaced the capability of the health industry to deliver services to all the American people. The problem has become a matter of national concern. The School of Public Health and the Medical School recently established the Harvard Center for Community Health and Medical Care to focus on ways in which the University can help improve the organization and delivery of health services to the community. The program includes both research in this problem and the development of new ways to train professionals in designing, managing, and evaluating health service systems.

HEALTH PLANNING. Last year the School's Department of Health Services Administration created a new course to give students practice in the design of a medical care plan. Groups of students worked in four Boston and Greater Boston neighborhoods where about one-half the residents are at the poverty level. Each group surveyed the health needs of its area and came up with a total medical care plan that took up such problems as health facilities needed and their organization, possible kinds of financing, and the coordination of home and health center care. At the end of the course the students presented reports to the community health agencies, neighborhood centers, and others who had cooperated in the study.

TRAINING CITIZENS. In cooperation with ABCD (Action for Boston Community Development), the School of Public Health has begun a training program to help Boston citizens serve more effectively on boards and committees that determine community health needs and plan for health services. About sixty people a year will complete the 50-hour course, and be paid while they are learning. The first participants are people already serving on health committees; later, others will be trained as potential board and committee members.

RESEARCH. A group from the School's Department of Maternal and Child Health is looking into the particular problem faced by out-of-wedlock mothers largely from the Roxbury area of Boston. The study aims at finding out how often these women benefited from hospital social service departments and other social agencies, and how this is related to the mother's race and the particular neighborhood she comes from.

Nutrition

STATE SURVEY. In the fall of 1968 the School of Public Health launched a nutrition survey of some 8,000 people. Those who will be interviewed and examined were selected from 100 areas of Massachusetts where 25 percent or more of the residents are below the poverty level. Families will be informed of the findings. But the main goal of the study is a future program of education about nutrition, oriented to the patterns and needs observed.

IN THE SCHOOLS. Earlier the Public Health representatives conducted a nutrition survey in two elementary schools chosen by the School Committee in a depressed area of Boston. Some 320 children were given physical examinations and interviewed on what they had had to eat during the past four days. After the study, recommendations were made to the Boston School Committee for setting up school lunches and other feeding programs. Results of the survey were also communicated to the parents of the children studied, and the children themselves, in school assemblies, learned about the project and the importance of food and nutrition.

The Community and Behavior

CARDIAC PATIENTS. The well-being of people is affected in a hundred subtle ways by the kind of family and community life they experience and the services available to them when help is needed. In the School of Public Health, the study of such environmental factors centers in the Department of Behavioral Sciences. A number of the Department's investigations go on in Boston and nearby urban areas. For example the cases of some 350 Greater Boston and Worcester men who had suffered a first heart attack are being studied to determine the various ways in which the men responded to this crisis: how their responses varied with social status, ethnic group, and religious preference; the effect of the heart attack on personality, and family and work relationships; and the use each of the victims made of such community services as hospitals and health centers.

MENTAL HEALTH. Another project examines the influence of social and environmental disorganization on the prevalence of mental disorder in the city. Hopefully, results of the study will suggest ways of attacking the particular family and community factors that seem to precipitate mental breakdowns.

JOBS. A number of businesses have set up projects in the Boston area to recruit the hard-core unemployed into industry, and their experiences and the problems they run into in hiring these persons are being followed by a Department of Behavioral Sciences project.

Improving the Environment

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH. One of the major teaching and research efforts within the School of Public Health is aimed toward bettering physical conditions in places where people work and live. The focus for these activities is the Kresge Center for Environmental Health, based at the School but also encompassing health-related activities in other parts of the university. A number of the Public Health faculty serve as consultants on environmental problems facing Boston and near-by cities. One faculty member, for example, is advising the East Boston Citizens Committee on the problem of noise from Logan Airport, writing articles, speaking at meetings, and testifying before various city and state committees. Two other members of the Public Health faculty represent Harvard on the Advisory Committee on Environmental Health, which is helping the Massachusetts Department of Public Health find and evaluate ways of improving water supply, water inspection, the disposal of wastes, and so on.

AIR POLLUTION. Harvard specialists from the School also help out in two other projects of interest to the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. One is a study of the possible adverse health effects of the severe smog episode that occurred in New England over the 1966 Thanksgiving Day week-end. The other project is studying the idea of putting an incinerator on an ocean-going vessel and burning Boston's trash twenty or more miles out to sea.

THE JOINT CENTER FOR URBAN STUDIES OF M.I.T. AND HARVARD

Planning

AREA COUNCIL. A Joint Center team assisted the Metropolitan Area Planning Council for Boston, a public body organized in 1964, to prepare a program and a statement of long-range activities. The team worked up detailed reports and recommendations for action by MAPC on issues of development and redevelopment in the Greater Boston area. Their program appears in "Planning Metropolitan Boston," published by the Council last year.

MODEL CITIES. Cambridge was one of the first 63 American cities to be chosen by the federal government to commence a "Model City" plan. For much of the period during which the proposal was prepared, a Joint Center staff member spent full-time on it. He worked directly with the Cambridge City Manager, other city officials, and the Cambridge Corporation, and helped to arrange for contributions by faculty members of the two Cambridge universities.

RACIAL IMBALANCE. At the request of the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, the Joint Center in 1967 assembled a team of faculty, students and staff to examine the effectiveness of redistricting as a means of eliminating racial imbalance in the Boston schools. The concentrated technical assistance effort produced eleven possible plans, demonstrating that redistricting was feasible. The Joint Center has continued to provide assistance to the State Department of Education on this subject.

Housing

REHABILITATION. The largest rehabilitation project yet undertaken by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is located in Boston. Nearly 2000 housing units are comprised in the effort. The Joint Center this year is reviewing the entire program, to analyze its strategy and financing as well as the participation of the community in its planning.

OTHER STUDIES. Joint Center researchers in 1966 conducted a study for the Boston Housing Authority of patterns of life and social adjustment among people who live in low-rent public housing. Also for the BHA, the Center has evaluated the efforts of a private agency, Fair Housing, Inc., to find housing in desegregated neighborhoods for Negro residents of Boston.

Consulting and Advisory Projects

AGENCY STUDIES. The Joint Center has been especially active here. Its members have made advisory studies of performance and management for the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, and the Department of Public Welfare. In another project, the Center in 1967 evaluated the delinquency prevention program of ABCD (Action for Boston Community Development) the "umbrella" federal anti-poverty agency here.

OTHER EFFORTS. These range widely. Center staff members have advised police officers in Boston in setting up training projects in the Municipal Police Science Institute. They aided Boston Mayor-elect Kevin White in organizing traffic and transportation functions of the city administration, and in recruiting a new commissioner. They helped the Boston Redevelopment Authority prepare a proposal for a study of outdoor signs and lighting in Boston, which is now being carried out. Finally, the Center has undertaken a study of the arts in Boston, seeking to ascertain how they can be strengthened, and brought to a wider public. A preliminary report was issued and a conference held under the Joint Center's auspices in 1968; a final report will be issued in 1969.